Correspondence

with Vincent Salandria

1993-2000

Michael David Morrissey

Copyright © Michael D. Morrissey 2007

ISBN: 978-1-4303-2664-9

Kindle edition 2014

Contents

About the Authors
Acknowledgments

Preface
1993
1994
1995
1996
1997
1998
1999
2000

About the Authors

Vincent J. Salandria worked for many years as an attorney in the Philadelphia public school system. He studied law at the University of Pennsylvania and in the 1950s and 1960s was a volunteer lawyer with the American Civil Liberties Union. His first article challenging the Warren Commission's conclusion thatLee Harvey Oswald was solely responsible for the assassination of President Kennedyappeared on Nov. 2, 1964, less than two months after the publication of the Warren Report. In 1967 he served as adviser to Jim Garrison in the New Orleans District Attorney's investigation of the Kennedy case. He is now retired.

Michael David Morrissey was born in Washington, D.C. in 1946 and has lived in Germany since 1977. He taught English as a foreign language at the University of Kassel and is now retired. He received a Ph.D. in linguistics from Cornell University in 1973, and a B.A. majoring in Romance languages from The Johns Hopkins University in 1968.

Acknowledgments

I want to thank Vincent Salandria, of course, for allowing me to publish his letters (without wanting a dime of compensation, which he would not accept even if I offered it to him).

I also want to thank Mark E. Smith for a very careful reading and for pointing out a number of typos that I daresay even a conscientious professional editor might well have overlooked.

My wife Vera, as always, has been invaluable in ways too numerous to specify.

Preface

This is a collection of the letters exchanged between Vincent J. Salandria and a group of correspondents between 1993 and 2000. There were several other regular contributors in the group, but I have included only the letters of Vince and myself, and I have also substituted fictitious names for some of the others who preferred not to be identified: "Ralph Brown" is a college professor; "John Thomas" is a businessman and Vietnam veteran; "Joe Stimmins" is a clergyman; Owen Rogers is a Canadian researcher; Chad Perkins is an independent researcher.

I have chosen to make a permanent record of this correspondence, with Vince's permission and approval, not only because of the great influence it has had on my own life, but also because I think it has something to offer to future generations. It is mostly about the assassination of President Kennedy, and the intellectual and emotional challenges of dealing with the consequences and implications of that disastrous event are very much the same as the challenges we face now, post 9/11.

There is nothing essentially new about what has been going on since Selection 2000, and particularly since 9/11/2001. We have seen it before, and we have been living with it–mostly by means of the psychological self-defense mechanism called "denial"–ever since. The shooting of the president in a public square in Dallas in 1963 and the events of 9/11 were both spectacular, watershed events, and they are similar in many ways.

Both events were followed by long years of problematic, unpopular warfare (Vietnam and Afghanistan-Iraq). Both have been–to this day–so poorly and inadequately investigated by the government (the Warren Commission and the 9/11 Commission) that a large portion, by now in fact the majority, of the population believe that the government itself orchestrated or was at least complicit in these crimes. In both cases, all attempts by individual citizens or groups to deal with the myriad questions left unanswered by the official investigations are dismissed as "conspiracy theories," in astonishing disregard of the fact that the official theory, in the case of 9/11, is itself a "conspiracy theory," and quite an outlandish one at that in view of the evidence that has been presented in abundance by independent researchers (best summarized, I feel, in the works of David Ray Griffin). The official "lone nut" theory of the murder of JFK, though not a conspiracy theory, is equally implausible, as this correspondence shows in detail.

The most discouraging similarity between the assassination of President Kennedy and 9/11 is what seems to be the inevitable outcome of both of these "false mysteries"–"false" because the truth in both cases is clear to anyone who is willing to consider the evidence objectively–and "mysteries" because they are most likely to remain so, despite the abundance of clarifying evidence and popular opinion to the contrary, for the foreseeable future. This outcome is devastating to those who, with great effort, manage to cast off the blinders and see the truth that has been staring them in the face for so long without their knowing it. The further realization that not only are their worst suspicions

true, but that there is so little they can do about it, is almost intolerable. It is at this point that the significance of the self-defensive function of denial also becomes clear.

False Mystery: Essays on the Assassination of JFK is the title of a collection of Salandria's essays published in 2004 (Square Deal Press). There are many references to these articles, dating from 1964, in this correspondence, and what the letters reveal is essentially a group of younger men, myself included, trying to come to grips with the reality that Salandria has been fully cognizant of since 1964. My own date of "awakening" was November 1988, when I happened to see a TV documentary about the assassination called *The Men Who Killed Kennedy.* I have written about this in a book called *Looking for the Enemy* (2007), most of which was written contemporaneously with these letters.

This correspondence will, I hope, provide solace and strength to others who find themselves awakening, reluctantly, to the terrible political reality that unfortunately pervades and controls our lives–and all too often our deaths–not only since 9/11 and the subsequent "war on terror," which by now has killed thousands of Americans and tens of thousands of Iraqis and Afghanis, but also since at least Nov. 22, 1963, when our duly elected president was executed in a public square in Dallas, Texas. It is important, I feel, for people to realize that what they may only be beginning to discover now, or already have discovered, is not new, and that it dates back at least to 1963. At least this much sense of history is necessary, if we are going to save ourselves.

It has become almost platitudinous to say that those who cannot learn from history are doomed to repeat it (Santayana), but it is equally true that even those able to learn from history face enormous opposition in trying to avoid repeating it. The parallels between Kennedy's assassination and Vietnam (see *Looking for the Enemy*), and 9/11 and the "terror" wars, make this all too clear.

I hope this book will offer inspiration to those struggling to clarify and strengthen their understanding of and opposition to the forces that David Ray Griffin describes, in a word, as "evil" (in *Christian Faith and the Truth Behind 9/11*, 2006). Griffin is a relative newcomer to the world of what one might call "radical" truth (as if the truth could be anything else!), having joined the "9/11 truth movement" after developing doubts about the official story of 9/11, but his conclusions are essentially identical to those that Vincent Salandria arrived at in 1964 and has been fighting to disseminate ever since, both publicly and privately.

I have been most privileged to have been able to benefit from the thinking of this extraordinarily insightful, courageous, and loving individual, my dear friend Vincent Salandria, and interact with him and others in the form of this correspondence.

1993

These first letters preceded my joining the group. –MDM

VS (6/8/93)

…I enclose the *Main Line Times* article of 3/17/77 reviewing a lecture which I gave. I tell 12 reporters, "I have been up for debate for 13 years and no one has debated

me yet. If there was anything to debate it could have been debated." Now, after almost thirty years, I am still available on no notice to debate, and there are still no takers.

I enclose the Sept. 3 and Oct. 1, 1976 Nissenbaum letters showing that Specter had agreed to debate me and backed out of the debate. After backing out, he was willing to and arranged to speak on Feb. 27, 1977. When I learned of this, I vehemently objected. Whereupon his speaking engagement was cancelled, and I was invited to give the enclosed talk, which was entitled "The Design of the Warren Report, to Fall to Pieces."

You will note that in this talk I apologized for writing my early articles, which established a design for a microanalysis of the *Warren Report*. These early articles did not truly get written by me but rather jumped out of the government's *Warren Report* and its accompanying exhibits. In its exhibits the government reports on experiments which demolished the Warren Report. Let's examine one set of such experiments.

In the *Main Line Times* article I make reference to CE 399, 572 and 856. The government showed us CE 399 and instructed us that this is the bullet which was fired from a rifle which had a sight that would direct a bullet high and to the right. This bullet coursed through President Kennedy at a downward angle of 17°, making single holes in his coat jacket 5 5/8" from the top of his collar, and in his shirt 5 3/4" from the top of his shirt collar. It emerged from his necktie knot and struck Governor Connally in his back, shattering the fifth rib, emerging from under his right nipple. It then smashed his right wrist, shedding metal fragments in and around the wrist and lodged a fragment into Governor Connally's right femur. The bullet fell from a stretcher at Parkland Hospital sans blood, tissue, clothing threads and sans clothing weave embossed on it. It suffered essentially no loss of weight.

Every hunter in the world knows that a bullet looking like CE 399 could not have been fired into anything but tubes of cotton or its equivalent. But all of us are not hunters. So the government offered to us who had no hunting experience the benefit of the government's experimentation.

The government showed us CE 572, two bullets that had been fired into tubes of cotton. Lo, they bear a remarkable resemblance to CE 399!

But, just in case we remain in doubt, they offer the reader CE 856. This is a bullet, the government tells us, that was fired into a cadaver wrist. Lo, it is mangled and bears no resemblance to CE 399!

Why did the government spare us the trouble of conducting our own experiments? Why stuff these experiments which destroy the Warren Report down our throats? In my talk I review many other examples of the government's forced-feeding process.

If the transparent conspiracy theory is correct, and I believe it is, then I am not a seminal thinker. Rather, I am playing in my research the same role for the government that I play here: I am serving as a volunteer clerk.

If the transparency conspiracy theory is correct, then the question of whether the assassination was the work of a disgruntled husband, or the Mafia, or some foreign government, or some low-level rogue element of the U.S. government is put to rest. The transparent conspiracy theory requires conspirators who were in power, expected to remain in power, expected to contrive the investigation and control the press, academe, the Congress and the political parties–large and small. The conspirators expected to be able to control the responses of foreign governments. The conspirators even perhaps expected ultimately to be acclaimed for killing a monster.

Marty Schotz thinks the theory is crazy. Ralph Brown thinks it has merit.

What do you think?

VS (6/14/93)

Thanks to Marty Schotz, I enclose an article which appeared in the *Boston Globe*, February 23, 1993 which tells us that Robert F. Kennedy reviewed the manuscript of Paul Fay's book *The Pleasure of His Company*. Robert F. Kennedy did not see fit to edit out JFK's fears regarding a possible assassination of him by the American military.

Enclosed you will find Marty Schotz's letter of June 10, 1993 seeking to make short work of the transparent conspiracy theory. I must correct Marty with respect to Jones Harris initiating the idea that John would be killed. The McGinniss article which has me predicting that Johnson would step down and that John would run and would be killed appeared in the *Philadelphia Inquirer* in Jan. 1967. Chris Kefalos, who was present in New York City when Jones Harris told me John would be killed, can confirm that this conversation occurred in the spring of 1968.

The June 11, 1993 letter from Ralph Brown completes the submission.

Love,

Vince

[*Vince always signed his letters "Love," and I have no doubt that he meant it every time. I will omit the salutations and closings from here on, though, to save space. -- MDM*]

VS (6/30/93)

…While we slow down for the summer, our Pentagon and intelligence services appear to have Clinton's nose firmly clenched and are leading that boy into incidents they desperately need to create as the excuse for their existence and growth.

May you all have good summers.

VS (8/17/93)

…Enclosed you will find Gaeton Fonzi's Third Decade Conference keynote speech. In his address Gaeton made reference to Marty's believing-knowing analysis of the American public's psyche.

What Gaeton accomplished so effectively in this speech is to demonstrate conclusively that the Kennedy killing was the work product of a high-level conspiracy; that the United States intelligence community dominated its planning and execution, and that high-level persons in the American Establishment, knowing of the conspiracy, actively involved themselves in seeking to prevent the public at large from coming to know its true nature and purpose.

Gaeton has contributed and given fully of himself in investigating the assassination. He is one of my heroes. My role in assisting his efforts was of no significance. His accomplishments grew out of his extraordinary talents as an investigator and out of his dedication to an open society.

Gaeton is to present-day United States what Dave Graham Phillips (no relation to David Atlee Phillips) was to our country at the turn of the century. He was the quintessential investigative journalist of his day. He was also a novelist of considerable

skill who exposed in his novels the weaknesses of our democratic structure in that period which saw the defeat of the progressive movement.

I include the *Philadelphia Inquirer's* August 21 article which shows how we atom bombed Japan when we knew of the war weariness of the Japanese military and when we knew of their willingness to surrender.

Ralph Brown in his August 12 letter comes at John Thomas on the issue of the relevancy of our addressing political-economic issues. If I were a judge sitting in court, and I am not, I would rule the issue of collectivism vs. a market system irrelevant. But all of us, I know, come down strongly in favor of free speech, irrespective of relevancy.

Brown concludes with an intellectual dance with Marty Schotz on the value of postmodernism.

VS (9/9/93)

…Brown inquires about my feelings re the Posner book, *Case Closed*. When Garrison's book *Heritage of Stone* was released, Kirkwood's attack on him in *American Grotesque* was piled high in the bookstores. Gaeton Fonzi's book is scheduled for release on Nov. 22. I feel that the Posner book is the release of Establishment gas seeking to smother the Fonzi work.

VS (9/21/93)

…I enclose a note of mine dated Sept. 20, 1993 to Robert Meerapol, Esq. I also enclose Marty Schotz's letter which will be printed in *Jewish Currents*. Some of us may not be as certain as Marty is about the complete innocence of the Rosenbergs. But, a careful reading of the literature on the subject will, I feel, convince all of us that the Rosenbergs were framed by the United States government. It is this framing and their assassination by the government that provides some relevancy to our concentration of interest–the killing of JFK by the U.S. government.

MM (9/22/93)

Thank you very much for your kind words about my article [*"Chomsky on JFK and Vietnam,"* The Third Decade *1993, 9.6, 8-10, available at http://www.mdmorrissey.info/chomjfk.htm. --MDM*] and yes, I would certainly like to join your group of correspondents.

I enclose one of the remaining copies (I only made 50) of *Looking for the Enemy*.

I gather that you are as frustrated by Chomsky's position on the assassination as I am. After a year and a half of correspondence, it became clear to me that he wasn't going to budge–or, from my point of view, listen to reason. This was a very depressing, but in the end enlightening, experience for me. There was nobody whose opinion I respected more than Chomsky's, and nobody I would have considered less likely to be a victim of mind control. (After all, he writes about it all the time.)

I was wrong. Nobody deserves that much respect, and we are all victims, one way or another. If anyone else had argued the way he has on this issue, I would dismiss him as either being "on the payroll" or hopelessly propagandized. I still respect him too much to seriously consider the former, but I have no choice now but to conclude the latter. Propaganda takes many forms–and maybe that is not the right word–but in Chomsky's case the model or mindset or paradigm or whatever you want to call it which he obviously cannot escape from is clear: anything that smacks of conspiracy theory is "illegitimate," i.e. wrong, trivial, and ill-motivated.

In the case of Alexander Cockburn, who is by the way a good friend of Chomsky's, I cannot be so generous. As I try to show in the book, he fights dirty. Cockburn is much too talented a writer to resort to the sordid treatment he gave the Stone film without being aware of it. Why would he stoop so low in this instance? According to Deborah Davis (*Katherine the Great*), he was one of the flunkies sicced on her by Graham to destroy the first edition of her book, and at the time he was living with Graham's daughter. Doesn't sound like the behavior of a radical leftist to me.

More importantly, and as I have tried, as diplomatically as possible but to no avail, to point out to Chomsky, the simple cui bono fact is that he and Cockburn, leading the rest of the anti-conspiracy faction of the left, are aiding the Establishment press immeasurably by helping to discredit the notion that the assassination had anything to do with anything–specifically with the policy change in Vietnam. No one could be happier than the boys at Langley, I imagine, about Cockburn and Chomsky deflating the Garrison/Stone thesis with what I will call, in Cockburn's case, bullshit, and in Chomsky's case, sophistry, though I guess there's no difference.

I sent Chomsky a copy of my book, and he was not pleased at all. He was "shocked" that I had published his letter, even more than by the "quality" of what I had written. He said Schlesinger, whose letter I also included, would be within his rights to sue me if he wanted to, implying that he would be too. (Perhaps you as a lawyer can clarify that point.) Then it was my turn to be shocked, because I wasn't aware of anything he'd said in the letter that he hadn't said in print elsewhere. I left out the name-calling. He had referred to one person as a "raving fascist" and a "fraud" and refused to explain further, even when I pressed him. Nor do I have any idea what he meant by the "quality" of the book, unless he meant the recycled paper. I haven't written to him since.

I was quite startled, and pleased, to see in both Brown's and Robert Thomas's letters the references to a "let's show'em we've got'em by the balls" theory, which, when I then read Fonzi's speech, apparently originated with you. I have often considered this myself, but have never seen it in print. I agree with you. Why an ambush when a pill in his coffee would have done the job (as with Pope John Paul I)? Keep most of them busy chasing the details, and for the ones who dare to see the obvious, the message is clear.

As you'll see in my introduction and as I also fleetingly implied in the *Third Decade* article, I extend this theory to the Stone film phenomenon. For those who see the film as the truth, or close enough, what is left but resignation? As Brown says, for the True Believers there is the false sense of empowerment, but for the disabused (now the majority of the general population, I think) there is the false sense of disempowerment. Sure they can publicly execute a president, shove a fairy tale down our throats, make us fight their wars, and then even show us how and why they did it on the silver screen. That's enough to discourage anybody. But it's a scam. We can still win–if we only knew it.

Thomas is absolutely right–and this is exactly the argument I have with Chomsky et al.: explaining political realities in terms of the "structures" of capitalism is as helpful as discussing the weather. Worse, as he says, because we have about as much hope of changing the one as the other. For all Chomsky's volumes of talk about the evils of capitalism and the implicit call for grass-roots revolution, when the chance comes along to really have one–for that is what I think bringing the assassination and Vietnam together represents–he jumps over to the other side. I won't digest that anytime soon.

I think I'll send the first chapter of the book, "The Bay of Pigs Revisited," to *The Third Decade*, though it will probably be too long–and if Chomsky is right I'll risk getting sued by Schlesinger. But I haven't seen the case made elsewhere. If only someone could discover that Barbara Bush was once Barbara Jane or Jezebel or something. That would clinch it. Didn't Nancy Reagan falsify her birth certificate too? I tried the Smith College registrar; they have no record of a middle name–just plain old Barbara Pierce. An aristocrat with no middle name?

VS (10/4/93)

…Dr. Morrissey's letter of 9/22/93 is enclosed. He, like the rest of us, has had the experience of corresponding with Professor Chomsky about the Kennedy assassination. He, like the rest of us, has been instructed by Professor Chomsky not to circulate or discuss with anyone the contents of his letters, which the professor views as private although they are clearly statements on subjects of public interest on which he makes public comments.

Dr. Morrissey is in agreement with Brown with respect to his differences with Oglesby. He also seems to buy into the transparent conspiracy theory. He, like some others of us, thinks that Thomas is correct about the futility of attacking capitalism in an effort to get to the root cause for the JFK killing.

VS (10/22/93

…Gaeton's book, *The Last Investigation* is bound to be a classic in the field. My copy came with his penned admonition about the need for me to learn to keep my mouth shut. I trust that you guys have fared better from his pen. Gaeton, I am enclosing a small money order to cover the cost of sending your book to Dr. Michael D. Morrissey in Germany.

I have read Dr. Morrissey's book. Its quality is so fine that I am herewith asking him permission to duplicate it for distribution to our correspondents.

Dr. Morrissey, I know nothing about science, and therefore cannot evaluate your material on AIDS. For a long time now I have struggled with the question of why our rulers have not addressed in a world undergoing a cybernetic revolution with a consequent reduction in the need for human labor in post-industrial capitalism the problem of a burgeoning world population. You provide a hypothesis to explain AIDS as such a problem-solving device.

Because of my ignorance of science, I cannot evaluate the hypothesis, without running the risk of sounding like Professor Chomsky sounding off on the legal issue of what one can or cannot do with a letter one receives. But I ask you whether you should be addressing the question of the origin of AIDS in the same context of the JFK assassination. The killing of JFK at the highest level of U.S. governmental power I consider fact. The AIDS hypothesis is a theory. To join these problems together is to ask the public to swallow two large watermelons together. That is the way I see it. But what do you and the others of our group think….

VS (10/25/93

…My sense of the critical community is that it was from the beginning heavily infiltrated by the intelligence community. Powerful persons and forces which consummate a successful coup would not be satisfied to surrender to honest critics the task of analyzing the implications of the cover story or stories and the consequent effects

of the coup on our society. It is safe to say that the killers would place in the critical community various persons who would occupy the whole spectrum of possible analyses.

One or more would defend the Commission's findings but attack the Commission's methodology and explain away mistakes on the basis of poor methods, sloppy execution, time constraints, etc. Others would entertain a possible conspiracy but would emphasize the prolix nature of the evidence, the need to ascertain all the hows of the execution of the killing and the error of seeking to draw any conclusions about the meaning of the assassination until all the mysteries of how it was accomplished were resolved beyond a reasonable doubt.

Others would undertake to apply scientific analyses to the data of the Commission's findings and seek to attribute evidence that ran contrary to the Commission's conclusions as requiring further experimentation. Others would leap to the conclusion that there was a conspiracy of a communist nature. Others would emerge from the Birchite direction to announce that there was a U.S. governmental conspiracy so as to discredit that explanation. Others would leap forward with various other false sponsors such as the Mafia, low-level right-wing, rogue intelligence elements, and the like.

Others would come forward with an all-inclusive combination of big oil, big business, military-industrial, C.I.A., Joint Chiefs, Mafia, Johnson, Southern Rim, etc. to make the conspiracy so large as to reduce it to an absurdity. Others would emerge to trash JFK as the quintessential cold warrior and point in the direction of Castro. We can go on and on with this. I feel that I can identify persons who came forward with these approaches with the result that rather than improved political insight and knowledge growing out of the killing of Kennedy we got babble.

Dick Levy's October 24 letter speaks of Ira Einhorn and encloses an article on him. Ira came to me early and joined with Tom Katen, another writer and me to review for *Liberation* Epstein's *Inquest*. He toned down our stridency. Then he became a frequent visitor at my home.

He tried to get me to meet with his friends, Abbie Hoffman and Jerry Rubin. He befriended Gaeton Fonzi. Then I learned that he was supplying drugs to students at colleges, universities and professional schools. I also learned that he had barged into a meeting of people working in the peace movement. He told them that they should get bombs and undertake to practice terrorism.

When I confronted him with my evidence, he said that politics was street theatre, and that I should not take what he had done seriously. I told him that I strongly suspected that he was an intelligence agent and that he should stay away from me.

When Ira was arrested for murder, Arlen Specter represented him. He got his bail reduced to $40,000 or $4,000 cash. Ira left the country before the trial. When he was recently prosecuted and convicted of murder in absentia, the newspapers carried accounts that Ira had told friends that he was connected with U.S. intelligence.

Ira, in my judgment was an exemplar of one type of agent employed by the CIA during the 1960s and 70s to bring confusion and disrepute to the JFK assassination inquiry, the peace movement and the civil rights movement.

The agents who infiltrated the critical community were of various types and served various purposes. They shaped and participated in the debates on the subject. The bad critics were accepted by the media to drive the good critics from the marketplace of ideas.

Some of these critics were originally well intentioned but got tipped into serving the interests of the Establishment. I can recall being visited very early in 1965 by Professor Jacob Cohen of Brandeis University, who promised me wide circulation in the major news media. I declined the offer because I knew what would be expected of me. He then promised me tax audits. Those I got in profusion….

MM (10/28/93)

I've decided to order *Rethinking Camelot* after all. I've only seen parts of the newly declassified material, and I want to see if there really is any evidence that JFK's withdrawal policy changed between Oct. 11, 1963 (NSAM 263) and Nov. 22, as Chomsky implies but never comes right out and says so. He vacillates between saying there was never a withdrawal policy in the first place, and saying estimates of the progress of the war changed radically after Diem's assassination.

The few pages I do have from the recently declassified materials (*Foreign Relations of the US*, 1961-63, Vol. IV) say the exact opposite of what Chomsky says, so I really don't know what he means when he refers (in virtually every sentence) to "the record" as supporting his view, e.g.:

Memorandum of Discussion at the Special Meeting on Vietnam, Honolulu, November 20, 1963.

Ambassador Lodge described the outlook for the immediate future of Vietnam as hopeful.... Finally, as regards all US programs–military, economic, psychological–we should continue to keep before us the goal of setting dates for phasing out US activities and turning them over to the Vietnamese; and these dates, too, should be looked at again in the light of the new political situation. The date mentioned in the McNamara-Taylor statement of October 2 on US military withdrawal had–and is still having–a tonic effect. We should set dates for USOM and USIS programs, too. We can always grant last-minute extensions if we think it wise to do so.

There was *some* documentary evidence of negative analyses of the progress of the war after Oct. 11, but there were many conflicting (optimistic vs. pessimistic) reports. The bottom line is still that *official policy*, nevertheless, as set down in NSAM 263, did not change between Oct. 11 and Nov. 22.

MM (10/29/93)

Our letters crossed.

It's true what you say about the watermelons. I just put them together because that's how they came to me. In a way, there is a connection. I don't think I would have paid any attention to the Segal theory at all if I hadn't been hit by the truth about the assassination just a few months before.

I'm not a scientist, either, just an English teacher. Still, I refuse to leave this discussion–or any other that affects all of us–to the "experts." We have seen often enough what this leads to.

I put this chapter through the e-nets and have gotten some pretty good response, though not as much as I would like. I enclose the exchanges since then.

MM (10/31/93)

On the role of CIA-infiltrated assassination critics, the problem, of course, would be finding evidence of direct connections. There is no question–in my mind at least–of the effects, which you summarize very well. As far as that goes, you would have to take

people like Chomsky and Cockburn into account too. I repeat what I have said before: No one has done more to undermine the potential political effect of the Stone film and critical assassination research in general than these two. I am referring primarily to myself, because of the high regard I had for them pre-*JFK*, but I know from you and from others that they have had the same effect on many other people. How many (literally) thousands of people, including some of the most otherwise politically aware, have decided, thanks to Chomsky and Cockburn and I.F. Stone et al., that the entire subject of the assassinations is better left alone? That is exactly what they are saying.

Back to Chomsky et al. in a moment, but I can't help bringing up another name in this context: Harold Weisberg. I know he has a fairly solid reputation as one of the early researchers, and the fact that he has had to self-publish his books speaks for him (though what I've tried to read is so poorly written as to be excruciating reading–this is one guy who could really use an editor). On the other hand, wasn't he the one who stole an early version of the *JFK* screenplay and leaked it to the press, who commenced their damage control even before the film was released?

Mainly, though, my suspicion of Weisberg stems from my very unpleasant personal experience with him. We exchanged a few letters in the latter part of 1990. At first he was friendly and seemed reasonable enough, but some of the things he said sounded quite weird, and I made the mistake (I guess) of repeating some of them to Harrison Livingstone. Livingstone, whom Weisberg described as "troubled," then showed Weisberg my letter, and Weisberg flipped out. He wrote me the most vulgar and insulting letter I have ever received, and probably ever will receive. I cringe to even take it out and look at it again. It was frightening. Someone who can sit down and write a letter like that to someone he doesn't even know, just because I quoted a couple of things he said (and he didn't deny that he said them or that the quotes were indeed his opinion), is for my money a psychopath, capable of anything. I apologized, not because I had felt I had done anything wrong, but because I had obviously (and quite unintentionally) hit a nerve in this guy (who made a point of telling me how old he was and how frail, how his fingers hurt to type because of bad circulation) that sent him over the edge. I didn't want anything more to do with him.

He said Lifton "presents an impossible theory as fact and knew that he was misrepresenting but that way he sold lots of books." Garrison is "simply not truthful" and his book (*On the Trail*) is "fiction." Marrs' *Crossfire* is "a summary of all the nut theories," "an atrocity," "a stack of awful crap," and he (Weisberg) could "not exaggerate the subject-matter ignorance reflected in the pages." Melanson's work on the King assassination is "a brew of crap." The Groden/Livingstone theory (*High Treason*) of faked autopsy photos and X-rays has "no purpose."

Of course I tried to pin him down on these summary dismissals, but got nowhere. I still don't even understand what he said about Groden/Livingstone (8/30/90):

They claim that the autopsy X-rays and photographs are fakes, were doctored by officialdom. The existing film disproves the official solution, as you'll see clearly I think in *Post Mortem*. So, the question I asked and ask is, why would the government go to all the trouble and potential great danger to fake film that destroys the mythology on which it had already fixed? The only apparent purpose of creating fakes is to substantiate the official mythology. So it makes no sense at all to allege that the existing film is faked. There is no purpose in such faking and there were hazards in creating fakes.

You refer to the "testimony" of the Dallas doctors. I think you were referring to what Livingstone said they told him, perhaps Lifton, too. But they were taken to the National Archives for the Nova TV show and they all came out and said that the film they had just examined coincided with what they recall from their observations of the JFK body at Parkland Hospital.

Here's part of my answer (10/29/90):

I'm afraid I still do not understand your point about the JFK autopsy photos and x-rays. Take the drawing/photo of the back of JFK's head, showing only a small entrance wound–that *does* support the mythology, but it does not show the wound described by the Dallas doctors or the one visible in Zapruder Frame 335. If that autopsy drawing/photo (cf. Groden, after p. 23 and 389) is not a fake, it must be of someone else.

As for the Dallas doctors, I believe what I saw and heard two of them say in the Turner (ITV) film (McClelland and Perry, I think). I didn't see the Nova show, and I don't know what the doctors saw at the Archives, or which doctors you mean, but if any of them were tricked or intimidated into changing their stories I wouldn't be surprised. Enough credible eyewitnesses have described the huge exit wound in the back of JFK's head to make that official autopsy photo impossible.

If there are things in the photos and x-rays that do not support the government's theory consistently, I don't find that surprising either. They didn't have much time and had to improvise as events developed and facts leaked out. Obviously, the cover-up was far from perfect, but why is this surprising?

In fact, in retrospect, the entire assassination and cover-up seem so crudely done that I wonder if the crudeness wasn't intentional. What better way to let us know, without admitting it outright, that they had (and have) us by the balls? Maybe they were saying: "Look what we can do. We blew his brains out in broad daylight, created a fairy tale, and got away with it. You can be as suspicious as you like, but we're in total control, and there's nothing you can do about it."

After all, they could have just dropped a pill in his coffee. CIA and their friends certainly had the techniques for causing "natural" deaths in 1963 just as they do now. Why go to the trouble of a public ambush and massive cover-up when it could have been done without anyone even suspecting foul play?

The Lifton book is weak because he doesn't go beyond the usual innuendoes about "dark forces." But if he is wrong about the body being altered, why did it arrive at Bethesda in a different casket and in different wrappings from what it left Parkland in?

I know it's asking a lot, and maybe when I get your book that will take care of it, but I wish you would explain why you find Garrison, Groden/Livingstone, and Marrs "fictional." Their conclusion is the same–that it was a coup d'état. Do you disagree with that?

I think Garrison rightly puts the finger on the CIA (Groden points more at Nixon, Marrs more at Johnson). Fletcher Prouty wrote a series of articles which he has been trying (unsuccessfully so far) to get published in book form, in which he carries further his notion of the "Secret Team: The CIA and Its Allies in Control of the USA and the World" (his 1972 book). That about says it all. The CIA (and allies) control the Presidency–this was Allen Dulles and Co.'s objective from the beginning. Now we have an ex-DCI (do they ever retire?) in the White House, and nobody bats an eye. After all that has been revealed about the CIA, it is riding higher than ever. Presidents come and

go, but the secret police remain, responsible to no one–certainly not to the President (regardless of what the law says).

Weisberg said in response to this (undated but ca. 12/5/90):

First, there is absolutely no non-paranoid reason even to suspect that the Dallas doctors were subject to any kind of pressure to get them to say on camera for the Nova show that when they saw the official pictures and X-rays at the Archives they saw what they recalled from their viewing of the body. They did not even have to agree to view the film. And when you read *Post Mortem*, you'll find that I quoted two of them in open disagreement with the official mythology and in 15 years not a thing has happened to them. I also call to your attention that none of the conspiracy theorists use those portions of a book that is widely used and misused [meaning *Post Mortem*, presumably].

You say you are not surprised that the autopsy film destroys the official story because "they didn't have much time and had to improvise as events developed." In considering what I say please recall that you go into Prouty and others in pinning it on the CIA. This is to say that the CIA also controlled the autopsy prosecutors. And indeed they didn't have much time! Until 4 o'clock nobody knew where the autopsy would be performed, and the body was at the Navy hospital not much more than three hours later. So, for the CIA to be able even to think that it had to phony the autopsy film it had to know where it would be done and then to be able to control all those having anything to do with the autopsy. Aside from the two military hospitals in the Washington area there were a number of excellent civilian hospitals and the District of Columbia coroner. For what you want to believe to be true the CIA had, within so short a period of time, to be able to control, into perpetuity, all the many people who would in any way have been involved in handling or just seeing the body and all involved in the autopsy itself, and can you imagine how many technicians of various kinds that would have included, aside from the doctors?

...A simple test you can make of his [Lifton's] honesty is to compare what he says about the body being in a plastic body-bag with the Saber-O'Neill FBI report on which he depends for his theory...the FBI agents are quite specific, there was no body bag. And they were there when the casket was opened at Bethesda...Like the body being in a different casket. The FBI agents, unless you make them part of the conspiracy, also disprove that. As I recall, in that same paragraph.

...when he [Groden] gets to making interpretations he goes wild. I've asked Livingstone, without any response, why anyone would go to all the trouble and great risk of faking any of the film and winding up with what destroys the very purpose of the alleged fakery...

You wonder whether the crudeness of the cover-up wasn't intentional, to be a warning to all. I've no reason even to suspect it. The plain and simple truth is that neither the Dallas police nor the FBI had anything to go on except what pointed to Oswald. So both immediately ordained a lone assassin. If you understood the way the FBI really works you'd know that Hoover, for whom this was an instant vision–and I have that in FBI records–didn't even have to tell the field agents. They knew how they lived and what was and was not expected of them. In Dallas, before Oswald was charged and from the internal evidence before the FBI supervisor even knew his name, he ruled out following any other leads because 'real subject has been located." That record was typed, checked through the indices with citations added by hand, annotated by the supervisor, was itself

indexed and was filed, *before Oswald was charged*! I have other similar records of that time. Do you now want to include the entire FBI in the conspiracy with the CIA–which Hoover detested?

You say it would have been easy to drop poison in JFK's coffee rather than go to all the trouble of the shooting. That would have had to have been done by someone who had access to his coffee and to him and that limits quite a bit. But you forget that there would have been an autopsy and the poison would have been discovered. And then it would have been child's play to know who could have done it.

Here is part of my answer (12/13/90) to that:

...I want to respond to your letter in detail because, frankly, I find it very confusing and I cannot believe that it is a true reflection of your thinking. I wish I had *Post Mortem* and your other books so I would have more indication of what you *do* think, as opposed to what you think is crap.

I did not see the Nova show (do you know where I could get a copy of it or any of the other assassination documentaries shown in the US?), so I don't know which Dallas doctors you are referring to, what they said, or what they saw at the Archives. You say the doctors said on camera that what they saw at the Archives is what they saw in Dallas, i.e. *supporting* the official version. In the next sentence you say two of them (which ones?) dispute the official version. Are you saying that because there is contradictory testimony, we cannot know which is true? If that were the case, we would never know anything. The adversarial system *begins* with contradictory evidence; it doesn't end there.

For my part, I really don't think it is a matter of "what I want to believe." Much more to the point is what most Americans do NOT want to believe, and therefore cannot believe. I saw and heard Dr. McClellan and Dr. Peters of Parkland Hospital describe and draw a picture of the head wound (in the British ITV film "The Men Who Killed Kennedy," in which you also appear–I presume you've seen it) which corresponds exactly to the lower drawings in Groden, p. 23 f.

You say that for the film to have been faked, the CIA would have to have known where the autopsy would be performed and be able to control everyone involved. What makes you think they did not know? Do you think they would tell us that they knew? The question of control is crucial. First of all, it eliminates every suspect in the conspiracy below the highest levels of the US government: the Mafia, anti- (or pro-) Castro Cubans, Russians, "renegade" elements of the CIA, Big Oil, Minutemen, etc. None of these groups would have been able to participate at all in the conspiracy, much less carry it off alone, without the full power of the government to protect them. The second question is, could even the full power of the government carry it off? The answer stares us in the face. The mission has been accomplished, to date. Of course people can be controlled. The FBI and CIA have plenty of practice at this. True, many people were involved, but not that many would have been in a position to put two and two together or, more importantly, had any concrete evidence and the courage to make it known. And how does any one brave individual make something known, even if he dares to, and resists threats, bribery, flattery, and appeals to patriotism? (Can you imagine being prevailed upon by the highest officials in government not to endanger the "national security" of your country?) Would the big newspapers and TV networks publish your information? Even if it were published, what then?

You seem to forget that not everyone *was* controlled. A lot of people have been killed and a lot more have simply been ignored. If they have not been completely ignored, it has been due solely to the efforts of private researchers like you. Absolute, 100% control is not necessary: the best way to keep the lid from blowing off is to let out a little steam. But the end effect, again, stares us in the face. Quite a few people have spoken "out of control." What happens? A book or two may be published and even sell (though the most dangerous ones, like Garrison and Groden/Livingstone and Marrs–and yours?) are not reviewed or advertised. We continue to have a mass of "contradictory evidence" and unanswered questions, with the end result–and that is what counts–that the mystery continues. That is control.

Re the body bag and casket. Why do you give the FBI more credence than Paul O'Conner? Do you believe the FBI agents who reported that there had been surgery to the top of the head and that the back wound wasn't longer than a finger (I don't have the precise reference)? Do you believe what William Webster et al. say about the CIA or what Victor Marchetti, Philip Agee, and other apostates say? Who has more reason to lie? Who has a proven record of deceit, conspiracy, violence, and collaboration with organized crime? You say yourself the CIA is the enemy of the people. Surely you don't think the FBI is any better. You say, "The FBI agents, unless you make them part of the conspiracy, also disprove that [the casket was changed]." That is the whole point. That is what Garrison, Groden/Livingstone, Marrs, etc. are saying. Of course they are part of it–not every agent, but the ones that count. We already know how they work, from the top down, but with plausible deniability, compartmentalization, self-defined accountability ("national security") and all the rest.

My question to you is: How can you believe that anything the FBI or CIA says has any credibility at all, especially when it supports the government's case? It is more logical to seek credibility in the few things they have produced which are self-contradictory.

...Your next paragraph is very confusing, because you say that the FBI field agents automatically responded to Hoover's vision that Oswald was guilty because they knew "what was and was not expected of them." But then you say: "Do you want to include the entire FBI in the conspiracy...?" You answer the question yourself: if Hoover was in on it, the whole FBI would have been in on it. Hoover may have detested the CIA, a rival (and much more powerful, since the CIA Director is also DCI) secret force, but of course he would have cooperated with them. He hated Kennedy too. Hepburn says in *Farewell America* that Hoover knew all about it and cooperated by simply doing nothing. That seems likely. At least, the core of the conspiracy would have to have been in the more powerful (CIA) rather than less powerful organization.

I do not agree that an autopsy would have discovered a poison or other simpler cause of death. First, the CIA has long had toxic agents that can simulate natural deaths and are totally undetectable. Secondly, you again seem to be skirting the implications of the thesis that the government itself was the perpetrator (that it was a coup d'etat). With this thesis, there need not even have been an autopsy, much less an honest one.

As for the tramps, or winos–what difference does that make? Winos don't have trimmed haircuts either. Why do you avoid the most important question, which is why they were released without any record of their testimony or identities? As for Lansdale, no one has claimed he was "the shooter." If Prouty is right, he would have been the one,

or one of the ones, in charge. "What in the world would have kept him from fleeing?" you ask. Obviously, nothing did! Let me ask you: Would you have believed, in a penny dreadful, that three tramps/winos could be "arrested" under such circumstances and released without a trace, and that whoever the other people were in the photographs have never been officially identified?

Weisberg's reply (12/19/90), in part:

...You appear to have accepted without question books that you should have perceived on your own are not really serious. Example: *Farewell America*. It was a phony, by the French spooks in SDECE. How you could as a scholar read that diatribe and not perceive that it is supposedly the solution to the JFK assassination yet it says almost nothing about it baffles me.

...There is no way we can responsibly say who did it. Period. ... Governments just do not work the way those who have influenced your thinking have led you to believe. The FBI, Secret Service, CIA and the military did not have to confer on how to cover up, yet all covered up.

But let us assume in terms of your thinking, that this was a conscious conspiracy. You are unable to distinguish between this conspiracy and one there undoubtedly was, to kill. Even if one assumes as you do, that both were governmental, there is neither fact nor reason to combine the two into one.

...Livingstone and Groden are friends and their book is a big success and it is still another that deceives and misleads the grieving people...the autopsy pictures and X-rays destroy the official solution. Now who in his right mind would create fakes to do that when he wanted the official solution to be believed? ...[Lifton] postulates a theory, which he really presents as unquestionable fact, that there can be successful conspiracies of thousands who preserve perpetual silence, no one of whom has any qualms of conscience. You should also be able to see that this conspiracy involved each and every one of JFK's most trusted, who then were with him...it was never possible for the conspirators to have unseen access to the corpse in the Dallas hospital or on the plane and in any event it was not possible to hide the corpse on the plane outside the casket. It was not possible to remove the corpse unseen on the other side of the plane, where as one of his alleged sources says, Manchester, there were 3,000 spectators within about 100 feet. As Manchester also states, the second ambulance was sent by LBJ's heart doctor in the fear he might have another heart attack. The second helicopter, as Lifton also knew, carried the honor guard from Fort Myer and from the airport to the Navy hospital. The back gate of which that [sic] he says was used to sneak the altered corpse in was securely locked as soon as it was known that JFK's body was coming there and the guard was removed so nobody could pull rank and demand it be opened for him. And if this doesn't give you enough reason to be unwilling to believe a word Lifton wrote, how can you trust him when in the very paragraph of the FBI report that refers to an alleged surgery of the head it also says that there was no body bag and Lifton doesn't mention that.

...You've gone for the nonsense that Penn Jones invented when you say, "A lot of people have been killed." Aside from the fact that most had no connection with or any way of having knowledge of the assassination, nobody was killed to silence him, none had not had an opportunity to say anything he wanted to say, some of his key ones were not even killed, and don't you ever ask yourself any questions at all? Do you think that the CIA has 80-year-old kamikazes who can pick the precise moment to drive the wrong

way on a divided highway to kill the cab driver who had already, on the record, destroyed the integrity of the assassination investigation? And even apologized on the record for doing it?

And if it were not for your addiction to the theory-book drug you [would] not be asking questions like about the hole in JFK's back being longer than a finger. Try to get someone to move an arm up and down and see what happens to the shoulder blade. JFK was erect when shot, prone when they foolishly and wrongly stuck a pinkie in.

This was the end of our substantive correspondence. Then came the incident with Livingstone, and I won't repeat the expletives that gave rise to from Weisberg's side.

Back to Chomsky, I am not ready to say he is a CIA agent, but frankly I find it harder and harder to dismiss the possibility. The only other explanation is that he is himself a better exemplar of mind control than any other Establishment stooges he has mentioned in his own work. Marty (in his letter of 3/25/93) says Chomsky could only have the outrageous position he does because he is "fundamentally uninterested" in the assassination and therefore does not know the evidence. Chomsky himself says he has been through the literature and finds no evidence of high-level conspiracy. The question is, first, *how* can anyone, especially anyone as politically engaged as Chomsky, be "fundamentally uninterested" in the assassination(s)? The second question is, *how* can anyone, especially someone as supposedly perceptive as Chomsky, have been through the literature and *not* have seen this evidence, which abounds?

Assuming he is not an agent and purposely misleading us, I can only guess that *fear* is a more likely explanation than disinterest. As Cockburn put it in his terrible review of *JFK*, if the conspiracists are right,

Out the window goes any sensible analysis of institutions, economic trends and pressures, continuities in corporate and class interest and all the other elements constituting the open secrets and agendas of American capitalism (*The Nation*, 1/6-13/91:6-7).

In other words, if the conspiracists are right, Cockburn's and Chomsky's life efforts go "out the window." If that is the way he really sees it, no wonder he can't see the truth. His assumption is wrong, of course. If *JFK* is the truth, it hardly nullifies what the Cockburn/Chomsky crowd call "institutional" or "structural" analysis. But if that's the way they see it, their whole lives, identities, sense of self, etc. (Marty can help with the terminology, I'm sure) are deeply threatened by the notion of conspiracy.

More simply put, if we are right, they are wrong. Especially now that Chomsky and Cockburn have so forcefully joined the anti-conspiracy faction, what will it take for them to say they were wrong, and so crucially wrong? A coup d'état occurred under their noses, and they didn't even notice, even after all these years. Chomsky, after all his "radical dissent" and acid condemnation of others as being mind controlled, would now have to admit that he was more mind controlled and duped and propagandized and oblivious to the most important political event of the century than a large portion of the population. It would take a big man indeed to admit that, even to himself. That is the fear, and I don't think the fear can be consciously overcome, even if one realizes it is there.

One has such an exalted opinion of Chomsky that it is very hard to imagine his mind functioning on such a mundane level, but it is the only explanation that makes sense to me, unless I am willing to question his sincerity. He is simply afraid to see that he has

been magnificently, thoroughly, royally screwed. All these years. Why should he be any different from the rest of us in this respect?

Marty's analysis of Stone (5/14/92), that is, of what has happened to Stone, seems exactly right to me. These are very perspicacious remarks. Again, in a word, it is fear, isn't it, but Marty expresses it much better. I would extend the analysis to Chomsky. He too has sold himself out, by rejecting conspiracy theories, for the right to maintain his position as "leading respected American dissident." His rewards may not be as conspicuous as Stone's, but after all, he too appears on TV and radio (more the latter), goes on the lecture circuit, gets interviewed and published constantly, and enjoys an immaculate reputation as a worthy opponent, even among those who violently disagree with him. How much of this would go down the drain (he must think), if he were to side with the conspiracists?

Fear, and Marty adds to that, narcissism. Yes, I can see both. Fear of exclusion, and the pleasure of the spotlight. I agree with what Marty says about Chomsky and I. F. Stone in his letter of 4/25/93 too, but I am skeptical of his embrace of Marxism and especially his enthusiasm for the former Soviet Union and Cuba. I know of no country whose rulers profess communism or Marxism where I would wish to live. I prefer the capitalist US or Western Europe, with all their faults. Someone once called me, after one of my rants against the Gulf War, an "undogmatischer Oppositioneller," which translates as non-dogmatic dissident, which I took as a compliment. I'll plead guilty to that.

Nor do I fault Chomsky for his (seldom expressed) syndico-anarchism (anarchism being not at all the same as chaos) or what he would probably also call conservatism in its true sense. The only label I would feel inclined to accept myself would be "Thoreauvian conservative": "For government is an expedient by which men would fain succeed in letting one another alone" (*Civil Disobedience*). I think that's the most we can expect from government. It doesn't mean we all have to or should take to the woods, though. Concern for the common weal does not have to be legislated, and ideally it should not be. If government can do the job of keeping us off each other's backs, I am willing to leave it to our positive instincts to improve the world.

That's a bit simplified, since part of keeping us off each other's backs is removing the structures of capitalist exploitation, and I suppose Marx was right about all that. What I cannot accept is the notion of the State being somehow superior to the individual. Feeling responsibility or love for others is not the same as having these feelings for some political order. In fact, that is where we so often go wrong, transferring feelings for people to feelings for abstractions, whether they be nations, ideologies, or religions.

VS (11/9/93)

…Michael asks me about Weisberg. I knew him before and during the Clay Shaw trial. He appeared angry, egotistical and was bereft of any social graces. But he tipped me off about Boxley. He was without funds. I went with him to New Orleans and had to pay his way. At that time I had no reason to believe he was not interested in discovering the truth about the killing of JFK. More recently, when George Lardner of the *Washington Post* called me, it was clear to me that Weisberg was cooperating fully with him. It was also clear to me, and had to be to Weisberg, that Lardner was doing the work of U.S. intelligence. Weisberg and I fought over whether Jim Garrison should go after the X-rays which the government had on JFK during the Shaw trial. I was against the effort, feeling that the murderers would not be helping Jim prosecute Shaw. Weisberg tried to persuade

Jim to go for them. I won the argument, and Jim lost interest in the X-rays. What is clear to me now is that Harold Weisberg has no problem cooperating with the government at this time….

MM (11/11/93)

There was a terrible article in *Der Spiegel* by the publisher, Rudolf Augstein, reviewing the Posner book and concluding that now, he (Augstein) "too" is now finally convinced that Oswald did it. Does anyone know of a good critique of the book (which I haven't read)? The Augstein article seems to use the same technique as *Time*, *Newsweek* et al.–mentioning everything (to give the impression of thoroughness) but actually making no arguments at all.

The only argument of Posner's that Augstein goes into is the timing of the shots, but as far as I know that argument has never been an important one for conspiracy theorists. No one denies that it might be theoretically possible to make the hits in that time, but no one has duplicated the feat and the likelihood of Oswald's having done it is very small. Augstein (I don't know about Posner) says nothing about the hundreds of other arguments for conspiracy, yet he is "finally convinced." That is the important thing, the only message the reader is supposed to take away.

The fact that Augstein and *Spiegel* are willing to put themselves on the line like this is clear evidence to me (as if more were needed) that *Spiegel* is as tightly on the leash as *Time* et al. and that the cover-up is as imperative as ever. Unless we want to fall back on the mind control analysis (i.e., Augstein really *is* convinced), which frankly I am getting a little tired of when it comes to people like this. It may be much simpler. Either he's an idiot or a liar, and clearly he is not an idiot. If anybody wants a copy of the article (in German), let me know.

VS (11/29/93)

…Morrissey asked for a critique on the Posner book. I enclose the November issue of *The Investigator* with Martin Shakelford's "Critique of Case Closed."

…Marty, I agree that Professor Chomsky is not a CIA agent. But with respect to his pronouncements on the JFK assassination he is worse than a CIA agent. Without being an agent, with his enormous prestige as a thinker, as an independent radical, as a courageous man, he does the work of the agency. He turns off his receptors and shuts off Marcus' scientific work. He is unconvinced by the evidence of a conspiracy, but his is utterly convinced that JFK was a consummate cold warrior who could not have changed and did nothing to irritate the military industrial intelligence complex. This is in the face of overwhelming evidence which appears in the literature and in the record.

I have wondered why Chomsky has refused to credit any evidence offered by Arthur M. Schlesinger, Jr. Perhaps I have found the answer in the enclosed pages from Schlesinger's book of 1969 called *The Crisis of Confidence* in which he deals with Chomsky with a brutality that would be hard to forgive.

Marty, in my judgment the assassins of JFK killed the *Presidency*. Before JFK there was Eisenhower and his farewell address. Here was a president who saved us from horrible wars when he dragged John Foster Dulles back from the brink on several occasions. Here was a president who would inform us that

…until the latest of our world conflicts the United States had no armaments industry... Now the conjunction of an immense military Establishment and a large arms industry is new in the American experience. The total influence–economic, political, even

spiritual–is felt in every city, every state, home, every office of the Federal Government...In the councils of Government, we must guard against the acquisition of unwarranted influence, whether sought or unsought, by the military-industrial complex. The potential for the disastrous rise of misplaced power exists and will persist.

In his forward to Fred J. Cook's *The Warfare State*, in 1962, Bertrand Russell, a pretty fair philosopher in his own right, said:

There is only one way of reversing the trend towards preemptive war. It is to make the truth known to the American public. This is a difficult task, since the military-industrial fanatics have a large measure of control over the major means of publicity.

With Tom Katen, I visited with Fred J. Cook in 1966. He agreed that the assassination was related to the military-industrial complex. He said he could not afford to write on the subject since it would require a major effort on his part, and he had a sick wife for whom he had to provide support.

Then we had JFK, who in his American University speech of June 10, 1963 spoke of the struggle for peace as a kind of dialectical process. See speech attached.

Eisenhower and Kennedy were presidents. Since the killing of JFK I feel that we have had no presidency. Clinton today must join the 11 to 15% of the American public who believe the Warren Report. He knows his limitations, as Johnson knew his limitations, as Nixon knew his limitations, etc. The CIA even placed its own former head into the President's slot and with no howls from a public thoroughly conditioned to accepting the clandestine aspects of the government as essentially the government.

Not only did the killing of JFK destroy the American public's confidence in the presidency but in essentially all aspects of the legitimacy of the government. The Chief Justice of the Supreme Court and respected members of the Congress and of the American Establishment placed their names on the Warren Report, which the American public considered to be a fraud. The public lost its confidence in the media, which refused to investigate the killing. These changes were significant and important, and they can be traced and are traced by so many of us to the assassination.

After the killing of Kennedy it was easy to splinter the broad democratic and Democratic coalitions in the large cities consisting of ethnics, the poor, the working class and the more liberal and leftish elements. Racism was fanned. Martin Luther was dispatched. To demonstrate that the Kennedy clan was finished, Robert was shot away. In 1975 Kirkpatrick Sale in his *Power Shift* said, "After November 22, 1963, everything changed." See the attached excerpts from this book.

MM (12/17/93)

First some heartfelt thanks are in order: for the Fonzi book, which has arrived and I am reading; for the second box of back correspondence; for copying and distributing my *Looking for the Enemy*; and generally again for including me in this very special group of people, which I appreciate more with every mailing you send out. This may well be the best way for us to live with the monstrosities that we are discussing. You have been living with it (or them) for 30 years. For me it's only been five, but it's already clear to me that the mental adjustment we probably all have to make to live with this situation is profound, difficult, on-going (perhaps interminable), and important.

It matters, I think, how we choose to live with it. I mean, lots of facts of life require adjustments, but our particular fact–what we know, as Marty says, as opposed to merely believing–is that the things we are talking about are things that we *think* we

should be able to do something about, theoretically at least, and therein lies the problem. We think we should be able to do something, but at the same time, and increasingly as time goes on, our "thing" appears as inscrutable and immutable as other bedrock facts of the human condition, like death and taxes.

Sometimes I think the others have it right: Why worry, there's nothing we can do about it anyway. I've been told that the Stone film turned a lot of young heads around, but I haven't seen any signs of it myself. That's what my German students say, at least, and I've always considered them relatively politically aware. I may succeed in shocking them, but most (if not all) of them succeed in "adjusting" very quickly. It's not that JFK is history for them. They react the same way to the AIDS question (which is one reason I go after both topics) and everything else. "Even if it's true, there's nothing we can do." That is generally the final response. Then they go on about their business. Not just young people, but also friends, relatives, colleagues. I'm sure I'm not telling you anything new. The thing is, how can I honestly tell them, much less convince them, that they are wrong? What should I say? Write to your congressman (or *Bundestagsabgeordneter*)? Grow up, study law, and change the world? (That's what I tell my 17-year-old-daughter, when I see an opening.) "Sure," they'll say. "Good idea. What's for lunch?"

Long story short, I think our group is important. We need this contact, and the way you have chosen to do it–by correspondence–may be the best and even the only way. These are not things you can chat about easily with your friends and neighbors, and what else can you do? Subscribe to the assassination journals, write articles, correspond with individuals, attend conferences. All of these are hit-or-miss, short-lived experiences. What we are doing, thanks to your initiative and support, allows us to share ideas in a way that just isn't possible otherwise–at leisure, at length, in detail, and over a long period of time.

You ask us what we think of Paul Hoch. I knew the name but had never read anything by him before. I would put him in the same category with Chomsky. If he is not on the (CIA) payroll, he's got himself fooled too, just like Chomsky. "The single bullet theory is not a joke"? Perhaps Mr. Hoch is a joke. Paul Hoax? I wish I could laugh.

I fully agree with you about Chomsky: he is worse than an agent. It's taken a while, but my opinion of him has diminished to the vanishing point and is still going. Ralph reasonably suggests that we should put him and Cockburn et al. behind us, but it's not that easy for me. Chomsky has occupied too much of my intellectual life to be easily dismissed. He must be driven off. First there was his linguistics, which as Ralph said in a previous letter, and as several of my professors at Cornell were notorious for saying (Robert Hall, Charles Hockett), is much ado about little. I've always felt that way instinctively, but since I also know I don't have a mathematical mind, my attitude was more: "Maybe it is great stuff, and probably is since everybody says so, but not my cup of tea."

I'm not very interested in linguistics anymore, but my impression now is that his original attack on Skinner and behaviorism was exaggerated, especially since his own theories may actually be much more mechanical, dogmatic, and simple-minded than Skinner's were. I don't think Skinner ever pretended to be doing more than exploring a very small aspect of human psychology, but Chomsky is much less modest. He thinks linguistics (his brand in particular) is a branch of mathematics and his grammatical model approaches to Objective Truth in a way similar to the laws of physics. His grandiose

observation that language ability is innately human and infinitely creative is as simple-minded and obvious a truism as you can imagine, but he is credited with this as a discovery.

The same thing could be said about his politics. Chomsky himself sees no parallels between his linguistic and political ideas, but there are some. Both are highly abstract, idealized models of the reality they purport to describe. People, as individuals, have no place in them. His grammar is Saussure's *langue*, totally abstracted from the reality of everyday speech. What people actually say doesn't matter; only the system is important. Likewise, capitalism, "business interests," or the "corporate sector," as he variously refers to the root of all evil, has no "interesting" or "important" connection to individual people or events. Everything that happens is predictable (post hoc!) and of course explicable by the overarching (and simple) paradigm. Individual presidents and murders of presidents don't matter. They can only be examples or manifestations of systemic pressures.

But ironically, in the case of the assassinations, he refuses even this. He won't even accept Dealey Plaza as an *example* of the diabolical forces he constantly (and always vaguely) refers to. This is the point where his contribution becomes negative. He rejects the best examples of his own theory (such as it is) of corporate imperialism and "manufacturing consent."

Chomsky's abstract approach, besides depriving people of the best examples of what he himself is saying, leaves us feeling powerless–as I think one of us (Marty?) has said but I can't remember who. No significant change is possible unless the entire structure of society is changed. There can be no revolution but total revolution. At the same time, Chomsky is not at all concerned with how such a far-fetched notion of revolution is to be accomplished. "Keep yourself informed but propaganda-free and support grass-roots movements" is all he can say. Again, an almost vacuous statement, and certainly nothing new.

What does the man really have to say, behind all the footnotes and rhetorical pyrotechnics (both of which are useful, of course)? "Business interests" drive US foreign policy, the media are prejudiced, and people absorb the propaganda and values of their culture. Thank you, Mr. Chomsky. Is this really all it takes to gain a reputation as one of the greatest minds of the twentieth century? What is going on here? Why has he achieved this exalted place in (some of) our minds?

I think the answer, as usual, is as clear as the nose on our faces: Chomsky is himself part of the propaganda. There is not just one set of things that people are supposed to believe; there are many. Chomsky is part of the set of things "radical leftists" are supposed to believe. We accept him as an infallible genius simply because that is the way he is presented to us. That's all there is to it. So it is written in the encyclopedias, the textbooks, and the journals–and thus in our minds.

It is not easy to learn to say (and mean it): "I am just as intelligent as Noam Chomsky." Even after a year and a half of correspondence with him, knowing that his argumentation was poor, I could not bring myself to think this blasphemous thought. I could not possibly be right, and he wrong, about such an important topic as the JFK withdrawal plan. Yet this is the case. I won our argument. There was no one who could confirm it, because there was no one whose opinion I respected as much, including my

own. This was a mistake. I suppose it's ok to have heroes, but in the end there's really only one, and that is yourself. So I have learned something from Mr. Chomsky, after all.

Change is growth.

Chomsky may well be the type who holds a grudge. I suspect he's got one against me, now. He is very tight, you know, with Ellen Ray and Bill Schaap. (I notice Ellen was on one of your earlier mailing lists.) Ironically, Chomsky is the one who first told me about *CovertAction Information Bulletin* (now *Quarterly*), and they published a couple of things of mine in *Lies of Our Times*, but either I'm getting paranoid or something (or somebody) has soured our relationship. I sent Ellen *Looking for the Enemy*, but didn't hear from her except for a short note from Danny Mintz saying they'd both read it and found the part on AIDS and the exchange with Chomsky "interesting." They don't even respond to my faxes anymore. I know they've got a small staff but not that small. The lack of response is suspicious. Chomsky gave the main address at their recent 15-year anniversary, and I wouldn't be surprised if I've been blacklisted.

I also sent the Bay of Pigs chapter to Schlesinger (minus the letter but with his remarks now incorporated in the text). If he responds, I'll let you know.

I had never read the complete text of JFK's American University speech. I see now why people have said it was so important. That was really extraordinary. No one, as far as I know, talked that way about the Soviets until after Gorbachev. That alone is enough to explain the assassination.

The Sale excerpt is good, too. It should be possible to show exactly how the assassination affected the economy (i.e. the things Sale mentions briefly on pp. 131-132), which companies profited most after the assassination and during the war, etc. I would like to see a strict accounting for that $570 billion that Vietnam "cost" (in 1991 dollars). Should be possible, one would think. Whose pockets did those dollars end up in, exactly? They are probably the ones ultimately responsible for both the assassination and the war.

Ralph should be assured that I am no more qualified to speak to the subject of AIDS than he is. I'm just an English teacher. I haven't even tried to learn about the biology of the matter, because I know I would never get far enough to make any difference. My basic principle regarding science and technology, however, has always been that if the "expert" understands the matter well enough himself, he should be able to make it understandable enough to the layman to satisfy his questions. This includes the ability to say "I don't know" when he doesn't know, which is something too many of them do not have. As you see, I've tried to follow the argumentation of the few who have been willing to talk with me at all, but when it gets tough, they invariably shrug you off.

Segal is an exception. If nothing else, he is clear. Unfortunately, and sadly, in his last letter he said that he is counting on no more than another year of active working life (he is 83 and in deteriorating health), and even that is limited. I know of no one willing and able to carry on the debate. I have not been able to make contact with Dr. Robert Strecker. It's incredible that a question of this enormity should go unanswered, but we're used to that, aren't we? The situations, AIDS and JFK, are very similar.

Ralph's point connecting AIDS with the cybernetic revolution and the general anomie is well taken. On the other hand, I was "radicalized" by a TV program. That was the catalyst, anyway. So the media can have a mobilizing effect, even if 99.9% of the time it is for the wrong causes. Hence the strict control. But what about networking? This shows some promise. The connections are so complicated and chaotic that commercial

and government control at present is weak, and if the technology continues to develop apace the kind of control we see in the other mass media may be impossible. Whether this kind of communication can be considered social interaction is another question, but it does bypass publishers and television and film producers.

I have recently joined an Internet list called VWAR-L, which is a discussion forum for Vietnam vets and other interested parties. I joined as a draft dodger and ex-protester. I'm getting some flak, of course, but also some very satisfying feedback from a few people. Unfortunately, the listowner has banned the discussion of "conspiracy theories" and threatened to delete me from the list if I do not comply, so this is obviously a counterexample to the point I was just making, but there are other lists–thousands I think–and the nature of the medium, plus the sheer volume (number of messages sent and people sending them), would make widespread control very difficult.

Good to know this inside information about Livingstone, Weisberg, and Lardner. Weisberg told me Livingstone was "troubled." I think they are both troubled, and trouble for anybody who messes with them. I felt the same way about *High Treason 2* as Ralph feels about *Killing the Truth* (which I haven't read yet)–a "small hand grenade" with some useful information, but much more that is confusing, contradictory, and in the end counterproductive (not the least of which is all that Camelot slobber). I wonder too about Carroll and Graf, because if any book ever needed editing, it was that one.

Ray Marcus is right that connecting the assassination with AIDS would be a tactical error. The evidence on AIDS is far from in. That was basically my point–that there are unanswered (and unasked) questions. The rest was mostly speculation on my part. Legitimate speculation, I feel, but obviously speculation. Our opponents will use anything they can against us. On the e-mail list I mentioned, "conspiracy theories" are lumped together (and banned) as one–including everything from the 60s assassinations to holocaust revisionism.

My specific tactical proposal would be to concentrate on demolishing the Posner book. It is an opportunity to focus. So many big guns have endorsed this book as Warren Report II (I'm dropping my subscription to *The Nation* after reading their laudatory review) that it gives us a chance to make a concerted effort to demolish it and with it everyone who has endorsed it. The Shackelford article looks like a good start, but there would have to be much more.

I agree with Dick Levy about the military. At the upper-operational end, all we have to do is follow the known command structure. McGeorge Bundy was the highest common denominator between JFK and LBJ. Below him was the DCI (McCone). Richard Helms was DD Operations, with Lansdale, Harvey, Phillips, Hunt etc. under him. The CIA uses the military, not the other way around. They had been making war in Southeast Asia since WW II and were in control of all operations until the Marines finally landed in 1965. I prefer the term MIIC: military-industrial-*intelligence*-complex, with emphasis on the last.

On that subject, has anyone ever tried to find out who gave–who could have given–the order to stand down to that army unit that was supposed to provide additional presidential security in Dallas? There must have been a command structure, and the number of people who could have given such an order must be very limited. Similarly the order for almost all the Cabinet members to take off for Honolulu and Japan. Is there any documentation on this? Did JFK himself instruct them to go? Who else could it have

been? Rusk and McNamara and the rest of them are still alive. Would it do any good to ask them?

In my opinion, only one person was in a position to give these orders: McGeorge Bundy. As to *his* bosses, I don't know, but it's probably nothing surprising. (As I said, I think an accounting of the $570 billion "cost" of the Vietnam War would give us some names.) Hepburn mentions some names in *Farewell, America*–one of the most interesting books on the assassination, I think. Seems to me the author, whoever he was, must have either been an insider or had access to an insider. What do you think? Nobody talks about that book, strangely. (It's out of print but available from Tom Davis.)

Further on Chomsky, he is not God. He can be right on some things, and wrong on others. He *is* wrong on the assassination(s) and on the Vietnam withdrawal plan. His argumentation is faulty–inflexible, dogmatic, sophistic (playing with words), illogical, and simplistic. He calls people names and will not explain why. He is arrogantly dismissive of people who disagree with him, and disingenuous.

As an example of the latter, I have a letter he sent to a *Third Decade* reader (who sent it to me) in which he says my article is "hardly worth commenting on," although we had just finished a lengthy correspondence on the subject, and he even thanked me at one point for helping him clarify his own position.

He is also a closet chauvinist, having written (and said in the film *Manufacturing Consent*) that despite everything, the US is "the freest country in the world." There were some groans in the German audience at that point, and rightly so.

As for the behavior of the Kennedy family, I think we saw the answer to why they haven't spoken out in 1963 and in 1968. They have families. Why should they keep sticking their necks out?

1994

VS (1/18/94)

Marty sends us a memorandum dated 1/1/94 captioned "The Mind of Kennedy's Assassins." I gave Jim Garrison Isaac Don Levine's *The Mind of the Assassin* to read prior to reviewing with him why I thought Bill Boxley was a CIA agent. I also gave Jim references to the secret executive session of the Warren Commission wherein Dulles tells the other Commissioners that he will ask Isaac Don Levine to deal with Marina Oswald, about whom he was to do an article for *Life* magazine (never published). Dulles said he would get Levine to convince Marina not to testify to the effect that Oswald was a double agent for U.S. and Soviet intelligence. After reading the book and the material on the Secret Executive session, Jim was ready to accept that Bill Boxley, whom he had trusted as a dear friend, was working for the CIA. Dulles, incidentally, was announcing that he was going to commit the crime of suborning to perjury. Of course, this was a minor crime, but Dulles was brazen about it. The Commissioners seemed to take it in stride.

Now, what Marty did was read the book and apply the psychiatric concept of projection to Isaac Don Levine's work. The results I consider enormously impressive. I consider Marty's approach as a Rosetta Stone to understanding the JFK assassination. He wants to use this approach and Castro's speech as the basis for a book. He feels that

annotations to the Castro speech along with the Isaac Don Levine piece would constitute a book.

Marty, I think that the book should be expanded. I feel that Castro was mistaken in feeling that the U.S. government ever intended to nail Cuba or the Soviets with the assassination. I believe that I can prove that the U.S. government never intended to have any other explanation for the assassination other than Oswald as a single assassin.

I feel that our book should sweep Dealey Plaza immediately after the assassination. We should demonstrate that the evidence of Dealey Plaza spoke clearly of conspiracy at the very time when the news media and the U.S. Government were foreclosing any options for any conspiracy. A government which does not keep options open in such a situation is necessarily a guilty government. All the evidence at Dealey Plaza which spoke of conspiracy at that time could have been wrong, but nonetheless, an innocent government would have to entertain it; analyze it; investigate it and reject it only after a thorough investigation had been conducted.

Our book should examine Oswald in accordance with the model provided to us by Isaac Don Levine of an intelligence agency's instrument for carrying out a political assassination. Marty's analysis of the Levine work will convince any fair-minded person that the intelligence agency that assigned Oswald as the patsy meant to have him killed immediately after the president was dispatched. If Oswald had not been killed we would have been able to have him clear up the following matters which now can be offered up as mysteries. If Oswald had not been killed the assassination would have been immediately traceable to U.S. intelligence. Here is why.

Oswald would have been able to provide us with an accurate chronicle of his whereabouts before the assassination. This chronicle would have cleared up the double and triple Oswald material. Whether he was in Mexico and why would be clear.

He could have told us why he had political contacts as diverse as the Communist Party U.S.A., Fair Play for Cuba Committee, the Socialist Workers Party, the ACLU, the White Russian community in Dallas, and the right-wing groups around Dallas whose meetings Michael Paine told me Oswald was attending and making notes about.

He could have told us why he was being baby-sat by George de Mohrenschildt. He could have told us about how Ruth Paine got him the job at the School Depository building. Ruth Paine, given a conspiracy, must have a connection. There was no way conspirators could have left to happenstance getting the Oswalds to the Dallas area, Oswald getting a job at the Depository Building, Oswald having a place to store a rifle, Oswald being able to live separately from his wife and children and Oswald not being able to get a lawyer after he called Ruth Paine to get John Abt, and she failed to advise him of her inability to get Abt. If Oswald had lived any longer, he would have wanted to know which agency employed Ruth Paine to accomplish vital aspects of framing him. Was this fine Quaker woman employed by the Mafia? By Castro? By right-wing nuts? By the Soviets? None of the above seem like probable candidates.

If Oswald hadn't been killed quickly, then all of the above would not seem like an insoluble mystery that was to keep a critical community busy for thirty years mulling over the rich load of dung deposited by the CIA so as to envelope us in a quagmire. While we were struggling to get one shoe free from this excrement, the CIA was ruling the world.

Once we view the assassins as being assured that Oswald was going to die at or soon after capture and without a record of police interrogation, we are confronted with assassins who possessed great power. These assassins knew that they would be able to have the patsy killed after they had killed the president. These assassins knew they could control the press and destroy the Anglo-Saxon concept of justice that one is innocent until proven guilty. These assassins knew that they could get the state of Texas to violate the law and permit the presidential limousine to leave the jurisdiction with vital evidence to be reworked by the U.S. Government. These assassins knew that they would be able to get the state of Texas to allow the president's body to be shipped out of the jurisdiction contrary to the law of Texas. These assassins knew that the autopsy of the president would be controlled. In short, these assassins knew that they *were* the government.

Mike, I am still in close touch with Ellen Ray and her husband, Bill Schaap. I am certain that they don't share Professor Chomsky's view of the Kennedy assassination. Jim Garrison had no better friend than Ellen Ray.

Farewell, America, Mike, was delivered to Jim Garrison while I was in his office. I felt it was CIA misinformation. I still feel that way. As for the Kennedy family, they were not protecting their necks. Rather, they were willing to stick their necks out for the system. Back in 1968, in early spring, Norman Mailer wrote me and asked me to meet with Jones Harris in New York City. I met with Harris, and he told me that Robert Kennedy had made a deal with the murderers on the Warren Report in exchange for a run for the presidency. Harris said that Robert Kennedy recognized that he should not have made a deal with murderers. Robert Kennedy, said Harris, would be killed so soon as he demonstrated that he was a serious candidate and would win the presidency. Chris Kefalos was present at that meeting.

I agree with you, Michael, that political action and the truth of the Kennedy assassination are not incompatible. But political action is rarely concentrated on truth. If there is a choice to be made by me between pursuing political action or the truth, I opt for the latter. Politics, as I see it, is the art and science of mobilizing people towards social ends, whereas the hunt for truth is its own reward, an end in itself and may run counter to one's political goals.

…Ralph, when I did my early work I found that the left was not much interested. The moderates were the ones who lent their ears. Castro tells us that the assassination of Kennedy was an attack on the moderates. He was, in my judgment, right. I think that the Kennedy assassination was more than internecine violence. This was a Cold War consolidation of the military-intelligence-industrial complex on the presidency and on the moderates in the politics of the United States….

MM (1/29/94)

Marty, I'm glad to hear you say that Chomsky is wrong and even dishonest on this question, which is a lot different than what you said last time. I agree. The only thing I'm not sure about is whether Chomsky is also lying to himself, but I am seriously beginning to think not. He's too smart for that. That would mean he is just lying to us. If that is true, my cynicism will have hit a new low. But that is what "dishonest" means, isn't it?

I also agree with everything else you said in the letter and the *Boston Globe* article, and I don't wish to quibble, but I think it would be simpler to use the word "capitalism" or "government" where you use "democracy," if we want that word to retain its meaning. Of course, the word is terribly abused by others, which I suppose is what

you are reacting to, but I don't think any of us would contend that our government, or any other government for that matter, approaches true democracy. Just out of curiosity, though, do you consider the Cuban government democratic?

I admire you for telling off the stooges at *The Nation*. Perhaps I should do the same, rather than just let my subscription lapse, but I'm not sure it's worth the 3 DM postage. I was also interested, and felt vindicated, to see that Fred Cook discovered their true colors back in 1964. What are we to make of this behavior? What makes them do it? Money? Threats? Patriotism (i.e., keep the lid on or the country will go berserk)?

I hope you didn't mean what you said to Vince about not being interested in "the case" anymore. True, there doesn't seem to be any doubt in any of our minds that the CIA did it, and as Vince says, the time for microanalysis has passed. I would add that the time for macroanalysis has passed, too, since I think we also know why they did it. The time now is for the psychological analysis, which should be of particular interest to you as a psychiatrist.

By the way, before I forget to mention it, Fonzi's book should remove whatever doubt remains about the CIA being behind it all. A great book, a mine of information, and most importantly, totally credible. I was surprised, though, at Fonzi's negative comments about Gonzalez, because I had thought of Gonzalez as the only guy left in Congress with any guts or sense of justice (Bush impeachment initiative, BCCI investigation). His attack on Richard Sprague doesn't fit this image. Strange. I would also have liked more discussion of the acoustic evidence, especially of the so-called refutation of it after the report came out.

Back to psychology. History, I'm sure, will look back on this whole period and see the most important question as this: How can so many people *not* have known what we know? I am not particularly interested in speculating about what the Kennedy family thinks about anything. I don't know them, never will, and have no idea how their minds work. What does interest me, crucially, is how people like Cockburn and Chomsky think, because having read them I feel I know them to some extent, and at one time at least respected and admired them.

You say, Marty, that "many of us have only come to know this very painfully and slowly–that the CIA could kill the President, and all the major institutions of power in the society would be essentially content to look away." Very true. But it's not just the institutions of power that look away. It is also the people we would least expect to behave like institutions. This is "the case" for me. How can people I thought I understood perceive reality so completely differently than I do? I am not willing to accept the notion of reality as total solipsism.

Ironically, Chomsky himself expresses this as "Orwell's problem": How is it that we know so little? (As opposed to "Plato's problem": How is it that we know so much? By which he means, How does language work?) I want to add to that "Chomsky's problem": How is it that a man like this can have such a big hole in his head, or be a shameless liar?

Vince, your very interesting observation that the "hunt for truth is its own reward, an end in itself and may run counter to one's political goals" brings up another question that is indeed something to ponder, probably for a lifetime, and my thoughts on it will not be terribly coherent, and very likely self-contradictory. I want to comment anyway, though, because it's a subject I have been struggling with.

I have no answers, but let me ask some questions. Take the AIDS thing. I have no "scientific" interest in the truth of this matter. Still, I am interested. Would I be content to "know" the truth about it, as we know the truth about the assassination? I don't think so. Why not, if truth was all I was after? What else would I want? I'm not sure. Which means I guess I have no well-defined political goals. But I know I wouldn't be satisfied unless and until *something* happened. This wanting something to happen–it's like your itch that won't be scratched. But it is more than a desire for truth. If it wasn't, we wouldn't itch, because we already know the truth.

Suppose I pick up the paper tomorrow and the truth about AIDS is written all over it: Segal is right; it was a biowarfare experiment gone awry. The government is investigating, the guilty will be punished, there will be stricter controls on such research, etc. Then what? The truth is known and officially acknowledged. The world is back in order–a little worse for wear–but back in order. Would I be satisfied?

I think not. We have exactly that situation right now with the radiation experiment business. I hadn't heard about it before, but those who did know about it must have felt the same way we do about JFK. Conspiracy buffs one day, and harbingers of the truth the next. One day, the powers that be decide the time is ripe, and they stop stonewalling. The walls come down; the truth is out. There might be a prosecution here, an institutional reform there. But two days later it's Old News.

This will happen, one day, with the assassination(s). That is, nothing will happen. One day, we (more likely, our children or grandchildren) will pick up the paper and there it will be: the Whole Truth. But what will have changed? *Who* will have changed? Very little, if anything. On top of that, we or our children or grandchildren will have to suffer the inevitable arrogance of those who will say, the day after it comes out in the papers, that of course they knew it all along. Where will the satisfaction be in that for anyone, whether it happens tomorrow or in a hundred years?

We saw it in Vietnam. After the war (or after Tet in 1968, when the government decided to begin pulling out), everybody became antiwar. Of course the war was wrong!

All we have to do is wait. The truth will out. And when it comes out, it won't be new or surprising, and most people will say they've always known it, having convinced themselves that this is so. Is this the truth we're after?

I don't think so. The truth, by itself, that is, the facts, will not be enough. I don't know how to put it, whether this wanting something to happen is political or not. Maybe what I really want is just some kind of ritual, to express my anger. Maybe art would be a better way to achieve that than politics. But I also want to see people squirm, to see their arrogance and self-satisfaction and apathy destroyed. And I do want radical change in the way our government(s) operate. So yes, I am political too. I have a hard time separating these things.

I guess we're all tired of hearing the name Noam Chomsky, but I have to share a couple of things he said to me, particularly after reading what Vince and Fred Cook had to say about Edward Epstein.

First, here is what Chomsky said to me at one point (July 1, 1992) about "the case":

You say the issue is whether the government is so corrupt that it can murder even the president and then keep it secret. That would be an interesting question if there were

any reason to believe that it happened. Since I see no credible evidence for that belief, I can't accept that the issue is as you pose it....

I personally have no interest in the assassination of JFK, RFK, Reagan (attempted), etc., unless there is some reason to believe that something of larger significance is at stake (therefore Hampton is far more interesting, and King possibly so)....

This should be enough (if we care what he says at all) to justify our continuing interest in "the case." Since it is clear to us that there *is* reason to believe it happened and that something of larger significance is at stake, we can be assured, by the Great Man himself, that we are not hung up on a triviality.

Secondly, here is an example of just how much Chomsky knows about the case and how he chooses to evaluate the data (same letter, my emphasis):

[Assassination theories] are in a realm where evidence doesn't mean a lot, because of the ground rules, which make them immune from refutation. Thus if we begin by assuming conspiracies and lying of cosmic proportions, all counterevidence can be eliminated simply by appeal to the assumption. *Thus when the National Academy of Sciences refutes by careful experiment the one reason offered by the House Committee to question the Warren Report*, we can simply conclude that the scientists are in on the conspiracy. Anyone who knows them personally knows that this is laughable, but the ground rules are constructed so that counterevidence is self-refuting.

Thus, for Chomsky, the Maverick Defier of Institutions and Established Thought, the HSCA and the National Academy of Sciences are the final word on the matter.

Thirdly, keeping in mind Vince's and Cook's remarks on Epstein, here is a passage in which Chomsky mentions the *only* assassination researcher he ever mentioned to me. It was in the course of denouncing Fletch Prouty as "utterly untrustworthy" (May 21, 1992):

Serious journalists dismiss him [Prouty]. Edward Epstein, who does think there was an assassination conspiracy, dismisses him out of hand, because his stories just don't hold up, even by the not-very-rigorous fact-checking standards of the *Readers Digest*, for which Epstein was writing. Nothing can be based on sources like that [i.e., Prouty]–even apart from the fact that he's a raving fascist, supporter of the Liberty Lobby, etc.

Epstein, for Chomsky, is a "serious journalist." Prouty, on the other hand, is a "raving fascist," though Chomsky did not respond to my request that he explain this.

What do you all think of Prouty? I've been corresponding with him for several years and I think he's ok. I think it was a mistake for him to associate himself, however loosely, with Liberty Lobby (*The Spotlight*, Tom Valentine), but I think he just wanted a forum.

Nuff said, perhaps. But while I'm at it, consider this too. Chomsky's early linguistic work was funded, at least in part, by the military. His mathematical, mechanical approach to language was (and perhaps still is) ideally suited to machine translation and whatever other military applications might be dreamed up. I'm sure that MIT is one of the most important, if not the most important, connecting points between academia and military intelligence and technology. It strains the imagination just a little to think that someone like Chomsky would have been tolerated on the faculty so long, if he were really what he purports to be–namely, the No. 1 radical dissident in the country, who calls Washington the "terrorist capital of the world." It doesn't fit.

Change of subject. I told you I am on this e-mail discussion list with a bunch of Vietnam veterans, and that the listowner (manager) has forbidden discussion of the JFK assassination (interesting in itself), but a few weeks ago I sent the following out "back channel" (privately) to about twenty people on the list:

The question I am pursuing is whether you think it is possible, from your experience with weapons, that a bullet fired from an elevated position (6th floor) a couple of hundred yards away to JFK's right rear could have caused the motion of JFK's head that is clearly visible in the Zapruder film, namely: violently and instantaneously backward, upward, and to his left. (Blood, brain matter, and a large skull fragment were also blown to the rear of the limousine.) The Warren Commission claimed that Oswald's bullet, striking the head at the cowlick at a downwards angle from the right rear and emerging from the right side of the head, caused the head to move violently *upwards to the left rear*.

One vet answered the question as follows, and I would like to know what you think of his answer:

Head jerks in the direction the round came from is normal. Action reaction dictates it. Remember that the round goes all the way through. So not all the energy is dissipated in the target head. The energy that is dissipated therein, and the energy still left in the round as it exits is the action. The reaction goes in the other direction, of course. The entry wound, being much smaller, has a *much* smaller reaction, so the head (or most any small loose object proportionate to the size of the round) is jerked in the direction of the gunman. One of the most solid arguments against a second gunman actually hitting the Pres. If the other gunman missed, well, evidence is inconclusive in either direction. You can prove this to yourself with a 9 mm and a watermelon. Works every time. I know it works on heads from personal experience.

I replied:

I will try the watermelon experiment as soon as I have the opportunity, but I must say this goes against my common sense. The only shooting I've done is with a 9 mm pistol at a firing range, and I don't remember the target moving forward at impact. Maybe the watermelon will behave differently. I will find out.

My second problem with this explanation is that I don't think I've heard it before. I believe the government ballistics experts explained the backwards motion of the head as a *muscular* reaction, which of course would not apply to watermelons.

I would also like to ask X if he could describe the personal experience he is recollecting. I wonder if even in Vietnam there were many opportunities to observe carefully exactly what happens when someone is shot in the head. Remember that I am talking about the moment of impact and immediately thereafter, not what happens to the body afterwards, when due to the inertia of the last position or motion it may fall in one direction or the other.

I realize that this is a gruesome topic, and I would not ask about it if it were not so important. But I value your opinion at least as much as that of the Warren Commission's so-called "experts" (more, in fact). So if you do have an opinion based on experience, I'd be very grateful if you'd share it with me–or perhaps you can send this query on to others who might be able to respond.

I got no response whatever to this query. Zilch. I guess I really will have to try it out myself. Any of you in a rod and gun club? (I think a cantaloupe would be better than a watermelon.)

Back to psychology again. I'm not sure this is relevant to our topics, but here is a comment I sent out the other day to VWAR-L:

I've been following the posts on guilt and victimization and would like to add my two cents. I live in Germany. I know no German veterans of World War II who have "syndromes" from that war. Why? I think it is because hardly anyone here is still struggling with the illusion they may have had at the time, namely, that it was a good idea. Those who still have such illusions (and there are some, of course) probably keep quiet or join neo-Nazi groups. But the vast majority of veterans and civilians accepted their defeat and their victimization by the Nazis long ago. They had no choice.

America also lost its war in Vietnam, but the difference is this: our government has not changed. It is still essentially the same as it was then. It has never accepted or admitted defeat, and has never allowed us–the veterans and the people in general–to "cleanse" ourselves of that war by denouncing and reforming the enormously powerful political and economic forces that made it happen. That's why the Vietnam War, in a sense, is still going on, and why emotions on this list still run high. The Germans could put it behind them. We cannot.

Not long ago Jonathan Shay [another non-vet on the list who is a psychiatrist and works with vets] wrote:

Loss of self-respect is damn near *universal* among survivors of severe, prolonged trauma under conditions from which there is no way to leave. Concentration camp survivors, incest survivors [remember, that's both men and women], battered women, survivors of political torture, of abusive cults, all experience this.

The incest analogy is interesting. Father rapes son and has son rape little brother. So son becomes both victim and perpetrator. But if son is to be healed, isn't the first thing he has to do to recognize himself as victim and perpetrator, and the second thing to recognize the father as the *primary* perpetrator and the only one truly to blame? What role does the son's subsequent relationship with his father play in the (possible) healing process? Should the son be enraged at his father, hate him, denounce him, indict him, see him punished, prevented from doing it again, and (possibly) rehabilitated? Or should the son just accept his victimization by his father as bad luck, and try to make the best of it?

In the case of the Vietnam War, father was Uncle Sam. Has he ever been called properly to task by the victims of his crimes, or by anyone else? Has he admitted his guilt? Has he been punished? Has he been rehabilitated? Quite obviously not. When Bush announced "our" triumph over the "Vietnam syndrome" at the end of the Gulf War, he did not mean that Uncle Sam had seen the error of his ways, but just the opposite. Nothing much has changed. I wonder if this is what lies at the heart of much of the psychological problems of Vietnam vets, as opposed to vets of other wars.

I would not be surprised if, say, VVAW [Vietnam Veterans Against the War] vets are more at ease with themselves, in general, than other Vietnam vets, because as political activists they have been able to *use* their sense of victimization to fight for others, and thus overcome it to some extent. Those who have not been able to identify the US government as the primary perpetrator and victimizer, and thus cannot express their rage in a meaningful way (through political opposition), are inclined to direct their rage

towards themselves and others (e.g., "long-haired Commie protestors") who are equally blameless. Note the great interest on this list in "soldier morality" at My Lai, etc. The far more important question is why *any* US soldier was there or anywhere else in Vietnam in the first place. Not asking it, or not continuing to ask it, or pretending that it has been answered, is simply letting Uncle Sam off the hook (where he belongs) and continuing to blame the victims (ourselves).

The veterans of WWII (on both sides) were able to begin their post-war lives in a political culture they felt a part of. The Americans won the war, and did not feel they had been screwed by their own government, so they did not have that estrangement to deal with. The Germans lost WWII, as we lost in Vietnam, and had every reason to think they had been screwed by the Nazis, just as Vietnam vets have every reason to think they were screwed by their government. But when the Germans lost their war, they also got rid of the government that was responsible for their suffering and the suffering they had been forced to cause others. They had a chance to start again, and re-integrate themselves into a new and rehabilitated culture.

Nothing analogous to that has happened in the United States since Vietnam. What we got instead was a Watergate here, a few confessions ("limited hangouts") by the CIA there. We've never gotten the whole story, never even been able to bang on the table and shout our rage and denounce the bastards (except in private ways), much less reformed the government. Many of the individuals who can rightly be accused of genocide against both the Vietnamese and our own citizens are still around, and still in positions of power. More importantly, the structures of privilege and power and greed are the same now as they were then. If there had been a revolution in 1968, with veterans and other "victims" (having turned their victimization into activism and leadership) leading the way, I suspect there would be a lot less "stress syndromes" today. But the revolution was decapitated (RFK, MLK), the same way a recalcitrant Administration under JFK was decapitated that had threatened to deprive the warmongers of their $570 billion war. How can any Vietnam vet "adjust" to such a situation *without* becoming an outraged political dissident?

My suggestion for thought, then, is that much of these presumably psychological problems are really political, and need to be dealt with politically. That is partly what I imagined I might be able to contribute to on VWAR-L. Jonathan also wrote:

What about the rest of us, who are not combat vets? Do we have anything to give, or should we just unsubscribe and get out of the way? I believe we *do* have something to offer. If we can be trustworthy listeners I think it matters a lot. But what does it mean to be trustworthy as a listener?

But my question here is, how can trust be built up just by listening and commiserating? How can someone trust me if he can't see me for what I am? (That's why I took a deep breath and plunged into the list as "Draft Dodger," etc.) And how can I trust him, if all I do is say "Uh huh" and "Amen" (however compassionately) to whatever he says? Maybe that's what shrinks are supposed to do, but I have my reservations, and in any case, I am not a shrink. It can also have negative consequences, which I've noticed occasionally on the list from some who seem to believe their "baptism of fire" gave them a halo.

Haven't gotten any reaction to this yet, either. I think they're ignoring me and hoping I will go away (which I probably will soon). I mention it here not only because of

the JFK-Vietnam connection, but also I think there may be something in this notion of recognizing one's own victimization before one can recognize that of others. I know it was true in my case. It was the recognition that I had been a victim of mind control (and perhaps still am, in some way that I have not yet recognized) that changed me. That was the key.

Victimization requires a perpetrator, and failing to find one outside oneself, one tends to take on that role oneself. I suspect this is true of all of us, not only combat veterans. But if the true perpetrator can be identified, one can resist the debilitating feelings of helplessness and hopelessness by fighting back at the perpetrator. Thus recognition of the truth and politicization go hand in hand.

Sounds simple, but it ain't, as our present discussion shows. Where is the perpetrator (enemy), and how can we/should we fight him/them, especially when so many of our fellows deny that a crime has even been committed? But who said it should be easy?

Vince, a couple of questions. What is it about *Farewell America* that makes it suspicious? Ditto for Josiah Thompson, William Turner and Paul Hoch, mentioned in your previous letter. Ralph also mentions Thompson's "non-argument." Are we talking about the author of *Six Seconds in Dallas* (which I haven't read)? I'm missing something here. Are these all repetitions of "Chomsky's problem," where we can't be sure whether they are just lying to us or to themselves as well, or is it clearer than that?

I have the Groden book. I was disappointed, though, that the identification and commentaries on the photos were not done more carefully. I'm not sure what the origin of many of the pictures is or what they are supposed to show.

I also have Livingstone, Scott, and you-know-who's *Rethinking Camelot* (the sequel to which, *Rethinking Chomsky*, I may write myself). I'll be working my way through them. Anything else recommended? *Crossfire II*?

I'm glad my Bay of Pigs article has come out in *The Fourth Decade*. It was also interesting to see how the other journals rejected it. *CovertAction Quarterly* finally answered, with somebody named Phillip Smith saying:

We regret that we are unable to use your manuscript. While your take on CIA motivations surrounding the Bay of Pigs is interesting, it is unsupported by any documents, interviews, etc. other than the one source you cite. And the speculative leap between Bay of Pigs and the JFK assassination is indeed breathtaking. Furthermore, CAQ is, as a rule, less interested in historical articles than in contemporary features that rely on substantive investigative journalism.

Now, this is not sour grapes. I'm used to manuscript rejections. But the "one source" I cite happens to be the *only* official one. Did they want me to take the lies of Dulles, Bissell, etc. into account? True, I limited my sources to this one document, which is not kosher, normally, but 1) it is the only one I trust, and 2) it suffices to make my case. And *no one*, so far, has denied that I made the case! That should be all that counts. Strange, don't you think?

I wonder, Vince, if Ellen Ray would think this jump is so breathtaking. Seems like just a little hop to me. What has happened to these people?

Here's what Erwin Marquit, editor of *Nature, Society, and Thought* (a new Marxist journal, recommended to me by Michael Parenti, who liked my article and thought CAQ should publish it) said:

Despite the interesting material contained in it, we find that its subject matter is appropriate for a journal that is less theoretical than ours. We would expect a historical paper on a subject for which a body of scholarly literature already exists to reflect critically the existence of this literature in the development of its arguments....I should add that your introduction of the controversial question of CIA involvement in the Kennedy assassination would certainly raise objections from the referees. This is really a separate topic that is an inappropriate add-on to the discussion.

Again, not a word about whether I made the case or not. If I made the case on the basis of that one official source, the rest of the "body of scholarly literature" is irrelevant. But for Marquit, in any event, the connection with the assassination is too "controversial," and not "theoretical" enough.

Ecco Academia. It makes me want to puke. Vince, I don't think you're going to get any interest from Edward Herman either. You know he co-authored *Manufacturing Consent* with Chomsky. I doubt that he will touch the assassination. Who needs these fools? I would rather do an Isaac Levine-type exposé on "The Minds of the Assassins' Minions," meaning all these academics who think they know it all and are blind as bats.

The Castro speech is indeed interesting. It may well prove to be the first document that told the truth about the assassination. I would be very interested to know what he thinks about it now. Also about the fall of the Soviet Union. I agree with what Ralph said about that (and other things) in his 1978 *Continuing Inquiry* articles. It didn't just happen. It was a plot, a long time in the making.

That article, Ralph, is astounding. To think that you wrote it in 1978! You touched on everything–the phony "population problem," the drug culture, the secret Soviet-American alliance, the unacknowledged right-left convergence. All things I have only recently become aware of. You've been at this a while, too, obviously. I feel like a babe in the woods.

Ralph, I was probably wrong to voice my suspicion about Chomsky discrediting me. I am certainly not important enough to merit his attention. I'm just bitter about him, that's all. I'll get over it. (At least, I'm working on it.) On the other hand, if Chomsky is willing to call people raving fascists and frauds in letters without even trying to justify the name-calling, that does not speak well for him. (His defense of Faurisson's right to speak doesn't bother me so much, though I also find it strange.) One thing is certain. His prestige is such that *if* he wanted to, he could ruin someone in certain circles without trying very hard.

I'm not sure what to say about building (or maintaining) bridges. With friends like Chomsky and Cockburn and Navasky, who needs enemies? I prefer enemies I can see, in any case. I can't see these guys at all anymore. I don't know who they are, what they want, or whose side they are on. I don't trust them. They say interesting things, but so do Lyndon LaRouche and *The Spotlight*, and I don't trust them either. (At least LaRouche and the *Spotlight* people recognize the truth about the assassination, whatever we might think of their other ideas.)

I don't think the assassination per se is more important than many of the other atrocities we can read about daily, but the mind control issue does seem much more important, and this is clearest in the case of the assassination(s). Furthermore, it's hard to see how there will ever be an end to elitist shenanigans when our own supposed pro populo leaders, whether left or right, are walking around with enormous holes in their

heads–assuming they are on our side at all, which is a serious question. How can I feel solidarity with people I think are either 1) more mind controlled than I ever was, or 2) on the side of the controllers?

VS (2/4/94)

…Enclosed is a letter to me from Jim DiEugenio about the Paines. I will, by way of answer, send him a copy of this letter without the enclosures. Jim, I don't know whether Shirley Martin is still alive. I did visit the Paines in August of 1965 with Shirley. Of course the Paines are federal agents. But Shirley Martin never advised me that she was of that opinion. We were close friends until the visit with the Paines. Then, on the way back to her home in Oklahoma she acted hostile to me. That was it for the relationship.

Michael Paine, who wasn't supposed to know me, when he met me told me to continue with my work in civil liberties and civil rights and not to pursue the assassination inquiry. He and Ruth both contended that they were convinced that Oswald was alone in the assassination. Michael told me that Oswald had been attending meetings of right-wing groups and would make extensive notes about what went on in the meetings.

Why do the Paines have to be federal agents? We know that the assassination was the work of U.S. intelligence. The plotters could not have left to happenstance getting the Oswalds to the Dallas area, housing Marina and the kids free of cost to Oswald, getting Oswald a job at the Texas Book Depository building, providing a place to store the "assassination weapon–which put the Quaker peace-loving folks on the defensive since Ruth was a prominent and respected Quaker, and getting Oswald to call Ruth Paine about obtaining John Abt as a lawyer and not making contact and not getting a lawyer for him. Michael Paine did not get secret clearance allowing him to work on military projects at Bell Helicopter, while having a father who had been a Trotskyite, without providing some quid pro quo to our government. The Paines could not have been associated with right or left wing nuts, the Mafia or spin-off elements from intelligence. They were good citizens who were in the grips of the CIA. They point directly to a high-level U.S. intelligence killing.

…In his January 23 letter Marty strongly disagrees with my thinking about the value of Dealey Plaza evidence immediately following the assassination. My interest in this evidence stems from my conviction that evidence of conspiracy that appeared immediately in Dealey Plaza, no matter how mistaken, could not have been dismissed by an innocent government at that time. The fact that enormous amounts of evidence of a conspiracy that confronted the world at Dealey Plaza was ignored, rejected and dismissed by the authorities proves the guilt of the U.S. government at the highest levels. An innocent government would have had to hold its options open. That's the way bureaucracies work, all of them. Only a guilty government would have foreclosed a conspiracy immediately after the assassination given the eyewitness testimony, the Secret Service agents' affidavits, the Zapruder film, the Nix and Muchmore film, the Altgens photo of what we are asked to believe was Lovelady, the propulsion of the President's body, the direction of blood, brains and skull fragments as a consequence of bullet impacts, the wound of Tague, the wounds of Governor Connally, the smell of gunpowder on ground level, the number of shots heard, the account of Holland and others of what they saw behind the picket fence, the reports of bullet fragments at the scene, the damage

to the presidential limousine, the slowing of the limousine after the first shots and so much more. Marty, I respectfully and lovingly disagree with you on this subject.

…[John Thomas's] discussion [1/28] of capitalism and socialism is not so far off from Marty's view. Kennedy's brand of liberalism which was willing to coexist with command societies even in underdeveloped lands, in my view, would have tended to lead to a new world order of a mixed economic system. Command economies would predominate in industrially underdeveloped countries. Mixtures of market and command economies would tend to predominate in more industrialized countries. Global, multinational conglomerates would not have gained such a powerful grip on the world economy. I agree with John that we are in for a "long twilight struggle" against a powerful and brilliant foe….

VS (3/1/94)

…On [Josiah] Thompson, I believe he was an agent from the beginning. I met him when I was called to get him and other peace demonstrators out of jail. He then curled around me trying to get me to write *Six Seconds* in Dallas with him. I separated myself off when he saw the front entry throat hit as an exit caused by exiting bone. Perhaps this is a delusion of grandeur, but I feel that he was sent in to give me media exposure and thereby neutralize and/or co-opt me.

…On February 12, 1994 William H. Schaap wrote to me asking for story ideas. Here is your opportunity, Mike. I would be honored to serve as your conduit….

MM (3/24/94)

I'm glad you sent some of our stuff to Ellen Ray et al., Vince. Thanks. In response to your request, I thought about suggesting again that Ray et al. go after the AIDS thing, but they have my book, and you saw Bill Schaap's answer. [I'm in contact now with two people in the States who are interested in reviving the origins question. One of them just came here to talk with people in Paris, London and Berlin (the Segals). Who knows, something may come of that, and if it does, we (or they) will be looking for a publisher, so I may try Ray and Schaap again at some point, though I am not hopeful.

I'll also keep David Starks in mind. I first heard of the Segals on a TV documentary that was shown here in 1989 ("AIDS–Die Afrika Legende"), and I've heard in the meantime that a Swedish group has done an English version of it, though I don't know what distribution (if any) it's gotten. An updated version of that might be the way to go. The problem is getting competent biologists to open their mouths (and minds). One of my new contacts, who caught some of my exchange with K.S. on the Internet, says he is a disinformation specialist. I did think it was unusual for a grad student to know so much about biowar research, and when I asked him if he'd had any experience in that area, he broke off the correspondence.

I was very impressed with David Wise's work when I first ran across it. What has he been doing lately? Seems he should be in the forefront of assassination research. I think all this work of the 60s is particularly interesting, in the same sense that the first reports of the assassination are–like the news report of "killers" you mentioned in your speech to the Women's League, and others that described volleys of shots like firecrackers or machine guns (or multiple simultaneous shots). There was that Buchanan book and *Farewell, America* (I still don't understand why you think it is suspect), Garrison, and of course your own work. That would be an idea for a book–recount

everything the earliest commentators had to say, then compare it with what has happened since then.

I'm glad to know that story about Bundy in the Situation Room. I've hated that guy ever since I used to watch him on TV telling us all about how vital South Vietnam was to US security. For me he epitomizes the depravity of Academia. Here's another idea (sorry, I'm an Aquarius): Before he dies, we ought to formulate a bunch of questions for him and figure out a way to force him to either answer or make his refusal to answer public. Same for Rusk, McNamara and the others that are still around, but Bundy for my money is the one nearest the top.

I'm surprised more people haven't caught on to it, but once you know how the national security is set up (all the intelligence agencies > DCI > Nat. Sec. Adviser > President), it's not hard to calculate the highest common denominator between the JFK and LBJ administrations. If it was a coup, or if there was *anything* going on that the government had to hide, and if the ostensible organization of the government has any relation to reality at all, Bundy *had* to be at the heart of it–much more than Johnson, who as mere V-P was probably out of the loop. Bundy was the No. 2 man. It would interesting to know more about his financial history and private connections. So if Dallas taught us anything and if organizational charts mean anything (which they don't, necessarily), if we want to know who's calling the shots now, we should look at Anthony Lake and the people he talks to, not Clinton.

Marty, I'm touched by your letter (March 4) too, because I feel you struggling for what I think we all want–a feeling of solidarity with some group larger than ourselves but smaller than humanity as a whole. You seemed to have picked on Fidel and the Cubans as a nucleus to adhere to. I'm afraid I can't follow you on that. Fidel is a charismatic figure, no doubt about it, but I have never lived in Cuba and know almost nothing about life there, so I cannot share your enthusiasm for his form of "democracy" (your definition).

I can't accept your notion of democracy as "any process" that "is leading us to the eventual achievement of that state," either. By that definition you could justify virtually anything, the end justifying the means. Why have you decided Cuba is the "inheritor of America's long lost democratic ideals"? What about North Korea, Vietnam, China, and the former Soviet states and satellites? What about Libya, which also practices a form of "socialism"? We shouldn't forget that the Nazis were also socialists. After 40 years of so-called Marxism, communism, socialism or whatever you want to call it rule in East Germany, it doesn't seem the people there have learned anything about democracy, and I have been repeatedly surprised at how little Marxism they seem to have absorbed there. I'm hardly an expert, but if they have anything to teach us they're being awfully quiet about it. The general impression is that they are more racist, nationalistic, conservative, fascist, close-minded, etc. than West Germans. That may be a false media image because of the skinheads, but it's widespread.

I don't like any of these words. As I've mentioned before, politically I am non-ideological, agnostic, and pragmatic. Anarchy is an ideal state, like democracy. Everyone shares equally in governing, or there is no government at all–both utopias. I think we should consider these directions, rather than goals. I still like Thoreau's idea of government as a device we should use to leave each other alone as much as possible. That would classify as pragmatic anarchism, I guess, or as I prefer to call it, Thoreauvian

conservatism (conservatism in the true sense, as Chomsky sometimes uses the term, having nothing to do with the current understanding of it).

It's interesting that in Khrushchev's Jan. 31, 1963 letter to Castro, JFK's agreement not to invade Cuba in return for withdrawing the missiles is clearly seen as a significant victory ("you have won a truce"), which we can thus assume was seen as an enormous defeat by the same faction in Washington that would have been upset by the nuclear test ban later in the year and the decision to withdraw from Vietnam. But K also says there was little hope of a disarmament agreement (p. 326), which seems to negate any significance of the 1961 McCloy-Zorin agreement as a factor in the assassination.

It was also interesting for me to see K's prediction that in twenty years "the material and technological basis for communism will by then have been created" (pp. 325-326). 1983 coincides pretty well with the advent of Gorbachev, doesn't it? I don't think we have the slightest idea what really is behind the fall of the Soviet Union. Gorbachev was not an accident, and neither was the 1991 (or was it 1990?) coup. These were not popular revolutions. I know it's grasping in thin air, but I tend to think people like Prouty and even the *Spotlight*, with their notion of a "one-world" conspiracy of capitalists *and* communists acting together at the highest level, may be on to something.

We are all searching for the truth of the assassination. But the problem I tried to describe last time was that of *living with the truth* once you think you know what it is. I think we're all facing that problem, primarily.

I like Marty's reference to Ghandi's "truth of witness." It is possible, and perhaps enough, to witness truth, as opposed to *establishing* it, isn't it? What does the latter mean, anyway? Once truth becomes established, it just means people don't think about it anymore (much less witness it). That's exactly what I was getting at last time. And then you point out something that may be often said, but is often forgotten–that we owe it to the children to at least be witnesses, to give them "a legacy of struggle for the truth," as you very nicely put it.

As for that solidarity we're looking for, I feel it within our little group, and I agree with Marty that Vince deserves enormous credit for getting us and keeping us together. If Marty finds solidarity with Fidel and the Cubans, I have no quarrel with that, but as I said I can't share it. I'll keep looking, but I'm also asking myself how well defined this notion of solidarity has to be. A country, a class, a political philosophy, a religion, a leader?

Just out of curiosity, what do the psychology textbooks say about this? Do they say "mental health" requires that we feel we are part of something larger than ourselves? Family, community, country–those are the usual categories. Beyond that, I would think, anything goes. Not that I think "mental health" is a very clear or useful concept, but I'm interested in how Marty sees it, as a practicing psychiatrist. Do we "need" religion, patriotism, a sense of identity with a social class or philosophy, etc.?

Ralph says (March 1) that political theses of the assassination are scorned even by "those who now want to show their epiphany and 'expose' the frauds around us." I guess you're referring to Livingstone and Weisberg. I still haven't read the latest Livingstone (not very inspired to start after what you said about him), but you're certainly right about Weisberg. He's a weird guy, and ain't got no couth at all. Who else were you thinking of? How about that as a subject for a book–how assassination research has consistently drifted (and/or been steered) into politically harmless directions. In fact, now that I've

said it, that sounds like an excellent theme for a book by all of us! Chomsky would take up at least one chapter.

Re Garrison, I've been wondering if it is correct to refer to him as the originator of the coup d'état by the warmongers theory. Was he the first to lay this on the line?

The O'Hehir article is unmitigated bullshit, but I may disagree with you on the Stone film. I think the message of the film is very clear. The interesting thing, which the O'Hehir article illustrates very well, is how the reviews manage to bury that message–which is their purpose, of course. How many reviews tackled the message–the central question–of the film straight on: Did the warmongers kill him because he was threatening to deprive them of their war? Very few. Note that O'Hehir doesn't even mention "coup d'état" until page 4 of the article, and doesn't mention Vietnam until page 5, and even then camouflages the message/question as I've just posed it, which is also how the film poses it. O'Hehir says: "Oliver Stone readily admits that he's trying to find out why he got so fucked up in Vietnam, his contention being that had Kennedy lived, the war would not have continued long. That issue is problematic, but never mind."

No, no. "Oliver Stone readily admits that the military-industrial-intelligence complex killed JFK because he wanted to withdraw from Vietnam." That sounds different, though. Concrete. True. Hear it and you have to deal with it. The purpose of O'Hehir journalism is to make sure important questions like that are not heard, much less discussed. *JFK* is not a "postmodern" film, in my opinion, nor is it particularly interesting as a film. It is a political message, thinly disguised as fiction, and that is its importance. That's why the firemen have tried so hard to quench it.

I guess you agree with me, from the rest of what you say about depoliticization being the goal of power, which I agree with. It was also the ultimate goal of *JFK*, as we've already discussed. Stone was used. Time Warner made the film for exactly the purpose that the results suggest: to depoliticize the entire issue of the assassination (and the war).

It may be true that the anti-abortion movement is directed at keeping women at home, but I think it's more than that. Bush has been a Planned Parenthood enthusiast for decades. Do you think this guy cares about helping parents plan families? No, he's interested in keeping down the Third World population (in the US as well as elsewhere). Now, if that were my first priority, and I was a politician, how far would I get in America saying it that way? And if I was a top-notch CIA guy, what would I think of as a cover for my real intentions? Why, I would assume the mantle of "pro-life," of course. Costs me little, because I don't think abortions actually make a dent in birth rates, and gains me the favor of all the pro-lifers, plus a great disguise for my true position, which is anti-life.

John, your reaction to that meeting of the Coalition is exactly what mine would have been. I'm amazed that Wecht is so naive about infiltration, and even more that Scott would hesitate to reject the Magic Bullet theory. I don't know anything about Lesar, but from what you say he sounds either suspect or so weak as to be useless (or worse). I've read some of Judge's stuff. It's pretty wild, but I wouldn't hold his ponytail against him. He seems to think the Power Elite are Nazis. Also that the Jonestown massacre was a CIA experiment. None are ideas I would dismiss out of hand, but they, rather than the ponytail, make it easy to discredit him. I'd like to hear more about and from him, but not necessarily as the head of a coalition. By the way, I learned in one of his articles that Mark Lane was Jim Jones's lawyer, which I believe raised some suspicion in Judge's

mind about Lane (plus the fact that Lane represented Liberty Lobby in the Hunt case). What do you all think of Lane? (I'll direct that question primarily at Vince, our resident jurist.)

In any case, I mistrust any organization whose first action is to ask for money, especially when they don't specify what the money is for. What will a "Coalition" do that the other groups haven't? I think you pegged them exactly. Refusing to reject the Magic Bullet is like refusing to reject the proposition that the moon is made of green cheese, just because you can't prove it. I'm not sure we need another organization. What we need is what John shows in his letter: RAGE. Red faces, shouting, and pounding on tables. I have no idea how that could come about on a scale large enough to have any effect, but I think that's what needs to happen.

"What is to be done?" John asks. I look at this first from a personal point of view. The biggest problem is burnout. It's hard to stay mad forever. When you lose the anger, you lose interest. On the other hand, I don't know if we can control these things. Either you're mad, and interested, or you're not. Most people aren't. Beyond that, and as part of that, I would say we are doing exactly the right thing. I feel better and better about our little correspondence group, and not because it is a substitute for doing other things, but because it is a foundation and a stimulus, an inspiration, to do other things.

Yes, Dick, I've seen *Jacob's Ladder*, but don't remember it too well. There was something about chemical warfare, I think. I also saw *Ruby*, just the other day in fact, but I don't have much of a reaction to that either. There were clear implications of CIA-Mafia ties, but nothing that struck me. Also saw *John Roberts* recently. Lot of truth in that one, too. I suspect there's more truth in Hollywood films these days than anywhere else. I can't get excited about them any more, though, for the same reason that I don't spend much time on the MLK and RFK murders. JFK and *JFK* are enough. It's hard to see how the "replays" will have any more impact than the original. I'd be interested in your analysis of the films, though.

The quotes from William James are interesting, and I especially like the image of the cow path in the woods, since it reminded me of Vince's (Crane's) Wayfarer. I was thinking about the contrast of the two images when I read Ray's letter (March 5). What if I became convinced that the correct model for reality is that the country (and the world) is, say, a city controlled by the Mafia? Would my priorities and behavior change? Would I care anymore about the truth? What if I saw myself as facing not a government and institutions that turn a deaf ear to the truth, but real criminals who would not hesitate to slit my throat if they thought I was important (dangerous) enough? It's hard to imagine, because in the back of my mind I still hope that things are not that bad. But the truth is that I don't know. That brings me back to the Wayfarer and the path filled with knives. It is not necessarily a metaphor.

Sorry. These are ugly thoughts, and paralyzing if you dwell on them. Some things you really do just have to banish from your mind, I guess. I could banish them now with the delete key, but I won't. I'd be interested to know if they ever cross your minds too.

But let me close on a positive note by saying again how much I enjoy and profit from reading all of your letters and other contributions.

VS (4/8/94)

…In Mike's letter of March 24 he ask me what my reservations are about *Farewell, America*. I no longer have the book. But I remember how it was delivered to

Garrison's office. It first appeared mysteriously as a manuscript. I recall coming away from reading it with the sense that it was not at all sourced. Its suspects were not the ones I had in mind. It supplied no explanation of who the writer or writers were and why they chose not to identify themselves. It could not be used as Gaeton's book will be, as an exemplar against which misinformation and otherwise wrong facts and theories can be judged.

Mike asks whether it is correct to refer to Garrison as the originator of the coup by warmongers theory. I guess that Tom Katen and I were the first to suggest this to Garrison when he arranged to meet with us in New York City early in his investigation. But, Mike, he deserves the credit, since he was the first public figure to espouse the view and was the first person to be persecuted for airing it.

Mike also asks me to comment on Mark Lane. That is not easy for me. I first met Mark Lane when we had dinner together as he came through Philadelphia on his first speaking tour. This was early in 1965. Spencer Coxe, the then Executive Director of the Philadelphia branch of the ACLU invited Lane and me to his home for dinner.

I immediately put the question to Lane whether he had considered Oswald to be a U.S. intelligence agent. He said it was possible, but he had no opinion other than that it was possible. He evinced no real interest.

At the dinner Lane offered to make me head of a Philadelphia branch of his committee to investigate the Kennedy assassination. Since I had and have an aversion to committees (present company excluded), I declined. He then countered by asking me to investigate the assassination in Dallas in the summer of 1964. I accepted this offer. He provided leads for me. I went to Dallas with my brother-in-law, Harold Feldman.

I thought that Lane used the information we obtained for him intelligently and well. I gave him some financial support. He encouraged me by complimenting my piece in *The Legal Intelligencer*. He invited me to New York to hear him speak in 1967. I was disappointed in the speech because it seemed like no more than a rehash of his doubts of Lee Harvey Oswald's guilt. He was in no rush to make sense of why the assassination had occurred.

We conducted a correspondence with one another. Although we had considerable mutual contacts, we really never got to know one another personally. The impression I got of him was that he was a leftist of keen intelligence and considerable courage.

In *Rush to Judgment* he acknowledged Harold Feldman's help and also acknowledged that I had assisted him. We never seriously discussed the case with one another. He had charm, but I detected little warmth.

He had an assistant, Deidre Griswold. I considered her bright, attractive, radical, sincere and honest. With an assistant such as Deidre, I could not imagine Lane to be an agent.

At the Shaw trial we continued to keep our distance from each other. He got Garrison the handwriting expert who identified the signature of "Clay Bertram" in the VIP room in the New Orleans Airport as Shaw's handwriting. This did not turn a losing trial into a winner, but it was nonetheless helpful.

I noticed that Lane wore fancy clothing, stayed at fine hotels, squired pretty women and had expensive tastes while he apparently had little income. But he was an attractive man, and I guessed that he garnered support for his cause from admiring people of means. The dualism of a radical with expensive tastes did not bother me. B. B. Shaw

in *The Quintessence of Ibsenism* spoke of Henrik Ibsen's radical ideology and taste for silk gloves and a top hat. This did not make Ibsen less of a radical.

The efforts from obvious governmental sources to discredit Lane convinced me that he was bone fide. However, I was disappointed that, depending upon where and to whom he spoke he would vary from stating that the CIA had killed Kennedy to shrugging his shoulders and stating that he did not know what had killed Kennedy or for what reason. I took this vacillation to be prompted by his desire not to lose his respectability for audiences before whom he appeared. I just can't claim to know Lane as a person as I have come to know and love each of you….

MM (4/18/94

I was glad to find your latest packet of correspondence on our return Saturday from a week in south Portugal (ah, sunshine!)–makes the re-entry more palatable.

I had copied the enclosed articles from *The Spotlight* before I left but didn't send them, because frankly I'm afraid of what your reaction might be to insinuating this dubious rag into our correspondence. But seeing your comments on Mark Lane, I thought it might be interesting after all to see that here, at least, he is quite straightforward about who did it. As for *The Spotlight* itself, I have very strong misgivings about it, since about half the things they say do smell of anti-Semitism, racism, and an ugly nationalism that is or borders on Nazism and fascism (I guess that's enough -isms for one sentence), all of which is at the opposite end of my own beliefs. But they also write stuff that I don't seem to read anywhere else (although living here it's difficult to keep up with the whole range of alternative publications). The article by Ryan, for example, seems pretty gutsy and on target. But then, in the same issue, there is an article headlined "Zhirinovsky: Mad Dictator or Enlightened Man of Peace?" which is pretty hard to take. My conclusion is to take everything they say with a boulder-size grain of salt, but not to dismiss everything just because some of it is obviously wacko.

The other thing I've tacked onto the second page of the Ryan article is from Peter MacKenzie's series published in the *Clear Lake Independent*, a weekly somewhere in Washington (I assume around Seattle, which is where he lives). I believe he used to be or still is an editor of *Freedom* magazine, which I've never seen but I know Prouty published some articles in it. Prouty sent him my book and he contacted me a couple of months ago. I was glad to learn there was at least one other person in the world interested in the origins question.

The Alfred Lee he mentions, the one who wrote the 1986 *Sunday Express* article (also enclosed), must be the same Alfred Lee we've been talking about. In 1986 the origins question was hot; now, with the re-emergence of the JFK question, it seems he's been reassigned to that disinformation team. This is quite a gamut of adversaries we're facing–from the Posners to the Lees, and everything in between. The "renegade CIA" theory, the No. 2 fall-back theory after the Mafia theory, will be upon us soon. The strategy may be to promulgate them concurrently rather than consecutively, since that would make for more confusion. "Renegades did it" is just another way of saying the Agency itself was not involved, and Lee makes sure we understand this: "...the CIA was not involved" (p. 6).

I read the other day in the *International Herald Tribune* of another of Posner's converts–David Marwell, director of the Berlin Document Center, who says, "With careful analysis and compelling new research and findings, Posner does indeed close the

case for me." Marwell thus joins Rudolf Augstein, the prestigious editor of *Der Spiegel*, and the rest of the believers. I still think it would be worth a concerted effort to debunk Posner, less to expose him than to expose the gullibility (or mendacity) of his converts, the latter being the more interesting and revealing phenomenon. In fact, this is the kind of *specific* project that an organization like the Judge-Lesar Coalition could and should take on, in my opinion.

A couple of weeks ago I paid a visit to the Heiligenrode gun club. (Heiligenrode is the village where I actually live, which is incorporated with another town called Sandershausen to form Niestetal–the Nieste being a little brook that runs into the Fulda–which is really a suburb of Kassel. Bit of local German Landeskunde in case anybody's interested.) I decided that I wouldn't ask them to do my experiment with the cantaloupe because I realized that it would be more complicated than I thought. I'd have to set up a video camera at a right angle to the cantaloupe and then play it back in slow motion to see anything at all, I think. Already too elaborate for me–I don't even have a video camera.

But they did let me shoot a few times with a .22 rifle from 50 meters at a target which was about the size of a cantaloupe (or a man's head). It was extremely difficult to hit, even with a perfectly aligned telescopic sight, a fixed support for the barrel, and all the time I needed to aim. The idea that even an expert marksman could have done as well, with a misaligned sight, through a tree, at a moving target 90 meters away, firing and reloading and re-aiming three times in 6 seconds under conditions of extreme stress seems even more preposterous to me now than before. Ralph, you would think every member of the NRA would be ashamed *not* to proclaim the Warren Report as bunk on that basis alone.

Interesting to learn from Monte Evans (p. 17) that the subject of the President's Foreign Intelligence Advisory Board meeting on Nov. 22, 1963, was how to dismantle the CIA. I wonder if there is any documentation on that meeting. This jives with Fletch Prouty's insistence on the significance of NSAMs 55-57, whose purpose (though sabotaged by McGeorge Bundy, as Prouty points out) was to effectively put the CIA out of the paramilitary operations business and put the JCS back in charge.

Ralph, I agree with you that intra-imperialist rivalries would have been enough to cause the coup, but why must you only "entertain the idea that JFK was planning a total pullout from Southeast Asia" (p. 4)? This was the plan and the policy, not a speculative idea–which is the point I keep trying to make contra Chomsky. It doesn't mean he wouldn't have maintained covert operations there and elsewhere, and it doesn't make him a dove. Nixon eventually withdrew from Vietnam, Eisenhower withdrew from Korea, Reagan withdrew from Lebanon, Bush withdrew from Iraq, and none of these presidents are considered doves.

Your remarks on depoliticization through the creation of illusory sites of resistance (the Internet of course being one too) are very astute, and I can imagine a wonderful book on that, if there isn't one already (or another one if there is). Assassination research, then, is just a microcosm of the larger phenomenon. If Vince's transparency theory is correct, though, it is more than a microcosm; it is also a prototype. "Nothing can be done" follows from "Nothing can be known," but behind both of these is the prototype: "We've got you by the balls." This is forgotten, or suppressed, because we

prefer to think of ourselves as irrelevant rather than enslaved, though it is farther from the truth.

Dick's chart of the royal family reminds me of the charts in Peter Scott's *Dallas Conspiracy* manuscript. A friend of mine back in the late 60s was planning to make a giant grid of interlocking connections among corporations; I wonder if he ever did it. The same could be done for the assassination(s) by someone so inclined, and with the help of some clever programming I'm sure some enlightening patterns would emerge. We lack the most basic information of this kind. As I've mentioned before, the population seems divided between those who believe wars are made for profit and those who don't, but the simple question of who profits from particular wars is seldom asked, much less answered, though it should be easy to answer.

I did not know that there was evidence that "the Japanese might have been preparing to surrender even before the bomb was used on Hiroshima," as Kai Bird says in *The Nation* article. Bundy would probably argue that in any case the "demonstration" served as a deterrent that has prevented nuclear war since then, which shows how much he cares about human life–as if we needed any further proof, after Vietnam.

I also enclose a comment on the Korean "crisis" that I sent out on the Internet, and also to LOOT. Every time I do something like this, I am truly amazed at how the press manages to ignore the simplest and most important questions, at how easy it is for us as readers to ignore them too, and then also at how easy it is to expose the incredibly misleading superficiality of the whole process just by paying a little bit more attention. You don't have to be Noam Chomsky or Alexander Cockburn, with all their talents and resources, to be a "radical" (giving them the benefit of the doubt here, for a change); all you have to do is ask stupid questions.

MM (5/21/94)

I have finished Scott's *Deep Politics and the Death of JFK*, and find it as difficult to comment on as it was to read. Yes, the government is corrupt and works with the mob(s). A little like saying your mother is a bit of a whore, isn't it? A bit of a killer, in fact. A bit of a mass-murderer, in fact. A bit of a beast that would slit *your* throat, too, if circumstances required. Why count the trees in the forest (to mix the metaphor)? Something is missing. Where is the rage?

I have (finally) started Livingstone's *Killing the Truth*, but will reserve comment until I've finished. I'm grateful for Ralph's review of the other recent literature, most of which I will now not feel compelled to read.

Ralph mentions Roland Barthes' idea of power and evil "inoculating" the public against itself. The spooks call that a "limited hangout," don't they? I read somewhere that applications for the CIA increased substantially after the "purges" of the 70s.

Vince, how do you reconcile being a lawyer with being an anarchist? I must say that my regard for the law has increased somewhat since I've been living in Germany. I'm only here at all because I sued successfully for a permanent contract (on the basis of federal working law). Several colleagues followed my example, and this won me no friends in the professorial and administrative echelons of the university and the state. Another thing I noticed early on is that policemen here are relatively inconspicuous. They wear small guns, for example, not those cannons American policemen strut around with, and if they catch you DWI, they'll drive you home instead of throwing you in the

slammer, as they do in the States. The prisons, from what I've seen on TV, are much more humane than in the US.

A couple of weeks ago the Constitutional Court decriminalized possession (and consumption) of small amounts of marijuana (as in Holland, though I doubt you'll be able to buy it in coffee shops here). That is definitely a progressive change, and I'm amazed that it's happened so quietly. Aside from a couple of news items, I haven't even heard people talking about it. Imagine the furor this would cause in the States!

On the other hand, the Court also recently upheld the law that makes it a crime to deny the holocaust, which, whatever else it is, is certainly an infringement on freedom of speech. I don't thinking forbidding people to speak evil nonsense is the way to keep them from thinking it, and from what (little) I've read it's pretty easy to demonstrate that the deniers are full of crap. I suspect that some of them are agents, with the aim of discrediting–along with themselves–all conspiracy theories, including real and dangerous challenges to Received Opinion such as assassination inquiry. A whole bunch of people already throw us all into the same pot.

One more legal question, Vince. Forgive me if this is naive, but has there ever been, or could there be, a class-action suit (if that's the proper term) against the US government for any one or all of the various crimes involved in the assassination? Surely people have thought of this.

John, I love that comparison of Chomsky with the PBS art instructor! How very true. And where would he be if people realized that they didn't need him to fill in the picture for themselves? I suppose, if he is not an outright agent, he is happy playing this role of the sage intellect instructing us about how the world works. If it's all really quite simple (and knocking off the prez to fight a war is much too simple for Chomsky's taste), the professor is not needed. His date-book will no longer be filled. Who the fuck wants to read or hear his tedious and tortured prose about the latest US-sponsored crime (ok, maybe for the footnotes), when he has, as you say, no viable suggestions for what to do about it and at the same time denies any connection between these things and the public executions of our political leaders–a connection which just happens to be *exactly* the one (if there is one at all) that would ignite the revolution?

I'm glad to see you take up the Vietnam thread. I still can't understand why every Nam vet in the country isn't screaming bloody murder, especially after the Stone film. I would love to see this–a great big, loud, table-pounding, screaming, crying, long drawn-out (but not otherwise violent) revolt of Viet vets DEMANDING an immediate and complete answer to the question Oliver Stone put on the silver screen: Did the CIA blow away the president so they could fight their war??? The answer to the question is YES, of course, and it will come, but I would like to see it happen sooner rather than later. I was trying to work in that direction on VWAR-L, until the moderator cut me off. Oh well, the entire press Establishment cut Stone off (and Garrison, and and and).

I agree with everything you said to DiEugenio, John. How could Newman *not* be an agent, when an ex-CIA director (Colby) endorses his book? I think the book was part of the Time Warner straw-man scenario (featuring the unwitting but well-intentioned–and well-rewarded–Oliver Stone). Newman furnished the wood shavings for Cockburn and Chomsky's fire. I wouldn't count on Newman changing course when he becomes a civilian. He didn't get where he is just by donning the uniform, and taking it off won't make a damn bit of difference.

VS (6/13/94)

…Starting from 1965, for about five years, I spoke to many groups about the JFK assassination. Marty and Chris Kefalos attended some of those discussions. I found it to be personally rewarding. From the beginning I found the audiences ready to accept that a coup had occurred.

The arranged debates which get media coverage generally produce confusion. I feel that they are designed to thwart clear public thinking on the subject. I firmly believe that those of you who try out the speaking experiment will find that the public knows more about this subject than we give them credit for knowing.

Mike asks, as well he might, how I can be an anarchist and a lawyer. Well, Mike, I don't try to live the life of a pure anarchist in a governmentally structured world. I don't choose to spend all of my time in our prisons. I adjust to reality.

I distrust law as I distrust all manifestations of power. But I recognize that some law and some power are less damaging than other law and other power. Lawyers as a tribe? I believe that we are an avaricious, parasitic and brutish lot. But some lawyers tend to be better human beings than others, and I always strive to adopt the standards of the better of us.

I do not lie in presenting cases. I will not argue for a case in which I do not believe. I feel that my work in the law has been reasonably constructive insofar as I have in my judgment in my practice done more good than harm.

When I had a private practice, at least half of my work was performed pro bono. When I charged, I charged fees that were commensurate with the hourly rate of the earnings of my clients. I held other jobs in order to support myself as a lawyer.

In my view, until we improve ourselves as human beings, some government and some laws are necessary in order that we might not create a society which is even more wantonly chaotic than the present one in which we live. I view every bureaucratic structure, whether it be governmental, private, for profit or no-profit in nature, as requiring careful scrutiny. I believe that every bureaucracy tends to have as its end the perpetuation and expansion of itself. I recognize that power tends to corrupt, but I know that sometimes power is exercised better or worse than other times.

I became a lawyer in major part because my immigrant parents, whom I much loved, expected that I should become a doctor or a lawyer. Since I can't deal with blood, there was truly no alternative for me other than the law. I also secretly hoped that by becoming a lawyer I might someday help the likes of a Sacco and Vanzetti.

Dear Mike, forget about the class action idea. It won't work for many reasons with which I will not bore you….

MM (7/17/94)

A recent development makes me feel a little sheepish, having expressed along with the rest of you certain misgivings concerning the Coalition on Political Assassinations. Gary Aguilar wrote me a nice letter praising my "Bay of Pigs Revisited" article and invited me to speak at the conference in Washington in October (7-10). This is flattering, of course, and it's a chance to meet some people and give my theory (that the CIA sabotaged the invasion themselves) a wider audience, which Michael Parenti and Carl Oglesby have also told me it deserves. So I'll try to go, even though my department has refused to contribute any money for it.

Vince, I gave your letter to my daughter Lara to read, because I'm still trying to get her to go into law, and I wanted to show her that some lawyers are Good Guys. You make the case well. As long as we have laws, and especially since the Bad Guys are all armed to the teeth with them, we need all the Good Guys we can get with the requisite tools to fight them. Enter Vince Salandria, William Kunstler, Ralph Nader, Mark Lane, etc.

You may have read that the Bundeswehr has now been freed by the Constitutional (= Supreme) Court to roam the planet and fight where it sees fit, like any another grown-up country! There has been virtually no discussion at all of this among the mere populace. They'll still need a parliamentary majority to send troops outside the NATO area, but that hasn't been much of a problem in the US and I doubt that it will be in Germany. Japan, the US, Germany–the new Axis.

We had another visitor the other day–Chad Perkins. I don't know if I've mentioned him before, but he's the guy who called me up a few months ago from Baltimore and said he was coming to Germany and wanted to meet the Segals. I didn't hear from him again until now, when he calls from Moscow, on his way to see the Segals in Berlin, then to Kassel to see me, and then to Essen to see Segal's publisher. He stayed here overnight. He's doing some free-lance computer work in Russia and combining business with pleasure. He's not a biologist but is quite knowledgeable about genetics (his girlfriend is a grad student in biology at Hopkins) and has done quite a bit of research on the AIDS business. He agrees with Segal that HIV is most likely of artificial origin, and says he's talked to prominent biologists who also agree privately but wouldn't dare do so publicly because it would destroy their careers. Perkins himself strikes me as a rather scatterbrained genius-type (entered Hopkins at 15). He wears a ponytail and plays a mean banjo/mandolin, and I have no reason to suspect he's not exactly what he appears to be, a middle-aged leftist radical (whatever that means, exactly) like me. We've tentatively agreed to work together, but I'm skeptical, not because I distrust him but because I'm not sure what we can do without a lot of help from at least one other scientist in the field (like Segal) who takes the notion of artificial origin seriously.

One more little anecdote. We had a guest speaker here the other day, a Fulbright professor from someplace in the US (Thomas McCormick), who discoursed for an hour or so on "The Origins and Consequences of US Involvement in Vietnam." His thesis was that Japan had actually been the last domino, that in effect we fought the war for them, for the sake of maintaining Japan as the cornerstone of our Asian economic hegemony. I should have asked him if he'd just figured this out or if he knew all along that we were fighting for Japan. I'll bet a few people would have been surprised and a little chagrined to hear we sacrificed 58,000 of our own men and millions of SE Asians for Japan's economy. He didn't say anything either about the $570 billion boost the war gave our own economy.

I don't think this guy is exactly a rebel intellectual, though. The question I did ask, which I had prepared for my students beforehand (3 pages), was about the (possible) connection between the assassination and the policy change. (What else?) His answer was that there were lots of competing "policies" in November 1963; withdrawal was only one "option" being considered. I had quoted all the relevant documents, so I asked him what documents he had that would have the same or higher priority than NSAM 263. There were some, he said. "A friend" has them. I asked him what he thought of the

Garrison/Stone (coup d'état) thesis, and he said another friend (or the same one?) had been "personally offended by it." I guess there's not much question whose side this guy is on.

There's a connection here. I look at my students, who take all the information I give them and say, "Well, it sounds logical but it's just so hard to believe that all the hundreds and thousands of scholars who have worked and published on this before are so wrong." The information I give them (NSAMs and McNamara-Taylor reports, etc.) probably sounds as esoteric to them as microbiology does to me. I'm more or less in their position regarding the AIDS origin question. When you are overwhelmed by "expert opinion" on a subject you know little about, it's almost impossible to maintain a contrary position, at least not for very long. They'll wear you down, and common sense is the first thing to go. I don't know what the answer is to that. Pick something and become an expert yourself? I've tried to do that a little bit on this withdrawal policy thing. The result is me and a few other nuts against the rest of the world. I can't do it in biology. I dropped biology at Hopkins. If it was too complicated for me then, what chance would I have now? No, I think there has to be a more general approach. And it can't be this postmodernist "nothing is certain" mentality, because that is simply the mirror image of fascism; it makes us acquiescent slaves. (The acquiescent part being what disturbs me most.)

I hope you all won't think ill of me for accepting this invitation from COPA. I know the place will be crawling with agents. The whole thing might be playing into the hands of those who want to create an illusion of accomplishing something when in fact nothing can be accomplished in this way, any more than some "Coalition to Prove the Illegitimacy of the Rule of Saddam Hussein" could expect to meet at the Baghdad Hilton and expect to accomplish something. I'll have to do some homework and it will cost me, but I know I'll hate myself if I pass up the opportunity. If any of you plan to go too, of course, it would also be an opportunity for us to get together.

VS (8/25/94)

The hiatus in our correspondence was due solely to my need to vacation with my great wife in our country home. This aspect of my life runs counter to my philosophy that the world to be fair must be far more egalitarian in the distribution of wealth. So, I plead guilty to accepting this duality in my nature. It is because I understand my weakness in this respect that I would never trust myself near or in power.

…Marty is informed that Mr. Alfonso Fraga, Chief of Cuban Interests Section, Embassy of Switzerland, would like to be on our mailing list. I feel it is appropriate for me to take sole responsibility for sending this and future material to Mr. Fraga. Here is why. The assassins of JFK Cubanized the patsy, LHO. Later, they suggested that if indeed there was a conspiracy, then the Cuban government orchestrated it to avenge the CIA's efforts to assassinate their leader, Fidel Castro. In a true sense, therefore, the Cuban people were made patsies for the CIA's killing of Kennedy.

So, Mr. Fraga, you are most welcome to read exchanges among free-thinking persons of diverse ideologies, all of whom share a commitment to exercise our First Amendment rights. We exercise free speech in the United States, the way it was meant to be used by our founding fathers. We act as if these rights are respected by our secret police. We know they are not.

Should the CIA want to be included on the mailing list, I would ask them to request, as you did, to be included. Although they will not concede this, the Constitution makes them but public servants and no more. To the extent that they are and have acted as more, they are usurpers of democracy, which our correspondents treasure greatly….

June 17, Mike Morrissey writes about accepting a speaking engagement with the Coalition on Political Assassinations. Mike, I hope that my skepticism about this group's chances for building political strength to compel our government to reveal the truth about the assassination does not cause you to believe that you will be looked upon with disfavor by us in accepting a speaking engagement offered to you by that group. I would be most pleased to see myself mistaken about the prognosis for this organization. I hope that it is not thoroughly infiltrated by police agents of our government. I hope that it is daring enough to accept as proven that Kennedy was killed by the highest level of U.S. governmental military-intelligence power. I hope that this group will not seek to legitimatize the U.S. government and seek through further debate on this subject to dignify the government as being able to reform itself from with. I hope that it will not bury itself in the quicksand of myriad facts and theories regarding exactly how U.S. intelligence executed Kennedy rather than seeking to educate the U.S. people on the motivation for the assassination. I hope for all of the above, but I expect little. But as for your speaking before this group to advance the thinking of the honest ones among them, such is appropriate even for a purist and pessimist like me….

[Re Dick Sprague's *The Taking of America*, 1,2,3,] This early book contains a great amount of solid stuff intermixed with a good deal of nonsense. There is not a single footnote in the book….

MM (9/1/94)

Ralph's comments about the media "inoculating" us against any sort of infective and effective dissent, as I've said before, strike me as a theme worth developing, if it hasn't been done already. The idea of the media as propaganda is pretty old hat, but what Ralph is saying is something quite different. In fact, his model subsumes Chomsky's "propaganda model" by including Chomsky (and the rest of us) in it. If you like to develop theories, this would be a good one. It's kind of a jiu-jitsu move by the powers-that-be: they allow us to dig ourselves deeper and deeper into a state of (perceived) disempowerment simply by increasing the flow of information, which as Ralph says becomes totally indiscriminate. So the more and louder we shout, the less we are heard. Chomsky mentioned in a letter that on his speaking tour during the Gulf War he had the impression that he could have said anything at all and the audiences would have been enthusiastic, which indicated to him how close the country is to fascism. The man on the white horse could be a Perot or a Chomsky for that matter–the point is that ideas (and reason) just don't matter.

Marty and John, have either of you considered that the real policy-makers (whoever they may be) didn't care about "winning" or "losing" the war one way or the other? I think the primary purpose of the war was to generate the $570 billion it "cost." That mission was accomplished. Trace the money and you'll know who the "winners" were. All the rest of us are victims (not losers–the game ain't over yet).

I bought Weisberger's *Case Open* while I was in the States. Good God in heaven! It is absolutely unreadable. I have never in my life seen a published book so badly written and with such obviously non-existent editing. Livingstone's stuff is bad enough (same

publisher), but this is really incredible. What are Carroll and Graf up to? I just can't believe they would naively publish such a manuscript, without even correcting the punctuation! Weisberg may have some points to make, but *no one* is going to try to read this book (reading it through is impossible) and think anything except that Harold Weisberg is an idiot, or at best a functionally illiterate, petty and vindictive old fart. (His character emerges splendidly, despite the writing.)

Now, I do not like Weisberg and think this impression is accurate, but my question is, why did Carroll and Graf publish this monstrosity? If this is the rebuttal by the "dean" of assassination researchers to the upstart Posner, the upstart Posner wins, hands down. I can say that without having read a word of Posner, because the Weisberg book is such a travesty. I honestly suspect that Carroll and Graf did this on purpose to discredit the anti-Posner camp. They simply cannot have published the book without knowing how bad it is, and why else would they publish such a book, without even bothering to correct the punctuation, much less the discombobulated syntax?

VS (10/18/94)

On his way back to Germany, after addressing the conference in Washington D.C., Mike Morrissey called me. He told me how impressed he was with Michael Parenti, who was at the conference. I will add Mr. Parenti to this mailing list. If he has any interest in remaining on the list, I am herewith requesting that he drop me a note to that effect. By electing to be on the mailing list, he makes no commitment to participate in our exchange of ideas. Should his busy schedule permit him to elect to be on the mailing list, to elect to read some or all of the material, and should he wish to offer his ideas, they would be much welcome.

…August 22, Brown writes to Morrissey about Brown's materials for addressing public gatherings on the JFK assassination. What realistic probability is there that this society can be moved forward in a progressive political direction around the issue of the JFK killing?

August 31, Marty writes Brown about starting and stopping the microanalysis of the JFK killing data with the single holes in the back of Kennedy's coat jacket, the back of his shirt, and the front of the shirt at the necktie knot. A bullet in a seventeen degree downward trajectory which enters 5 3/8 inches down from the coat collar, 5 3/4 down from the shirt collar, and which exits at the necktie knot, perforce is headed skyward on exit. It must turn in mid air to do any injury to Connolly. Bullets, until spent, do not turn in mid air. Spent bullets do not smash bones.

A government which remains married to the single assassin theory in the face of the above evidence is necessarily a guilty government. A government which permits Connally's clothing to be cleaned and dry-cleaned in the face of the above evidence is a criminal government. A government which permits the presidential limousine to be removed from the jurisdiction of the crime immediately is a gangster government. Thirty years of microanalysis has converted simple, incontrovertible proof of a high-level coup for significant policy reasons into a cloud of mystery. I submit that such "truth hunting" serves the purpose of hiding the truth under a pile of worthless dung. I further submit that this research has been to a great extent government driven and directed by skillful agents.

…I enclose a 1972 speech of mine on the promotion of domestic discord.

…I also enclose the *NY Times* book reviews which appeared on Oct. 16 on the subject of what is intelligence. If the theses advanced in the three books reviewed have

any element of truth, how should a decent society react to the ideas? Should they be discussed? How will our society likely react?

Do any of you care to comment on public school reform in this nation? The concept of intelligence?…

MM (10/21/94)

I'll make this short, since I've enclosed a long-winded letter to John Newman that I felt compelled to write. [*See* Looking for the Enemy*, Ch. 4*. --*MDM*] I'll be curious to see how he (or anybody else) reacts.

I hope Judge et al. take my suggestion to set up an e-mailing list. That would be the most positive concrete outcome of the conference, I think. I enjoyed seeing and meeting everybody, but reading each other's books and articles and chatting a little once a year or so isn't enough. This will be a good test of whether the Internet has really had (or can have) any impact on the political process yet. The potential is there. Imagine large numbers of people engaged in a reasonable exchange of ideas–lots of Vince Salandria Groups. The technology makes that possible now in a way it has never been before. I suppose the question then is whether this will make ideas and words cheaper and less meaningful, or the opposite.

In my opinion, the focus of such a group should be on public education and mobilization. To take the release of documents as the main goal dooms the whole thing before it begins. But it lends the organization and activity a certain (temporary) "legitimacy"–though that could just as well be a disadvantage.

MM (10/30/94)

I want to say first, Vince, that I didn't know how thoroughly and coherently you expressed virtually *all* the ideas–way back in 1971–that have arrived in my own head in just the last few years. I wonder what my reaction would have been if I had read that article in December 1971. I really can't imagine. It seems like a previous life.

I agree with Ralph and Marty that you should have a *Festschrift*. I would suggest two volumes–one of Salandria's own work, and another of essays dedicated to him, running the gamut of topics but in his spirit emphasizing the macroanalysis. (I will contribute, if invited.) It's not just that you deserve the recognition. It's important that people realize–as I did not–how much insight about the assassination was floating around in the early period, albeit it in small, obscure journals. That is an important part of this history, perhaps the most important part–how the government-controlled mass media have overwhelmed and effectively obscured prescient and courageous voices such as yours.

Re Chomsky, the remarks Ralph quotes shows how far off base he is. I almost feel sorry for him. As Ralph said to me on the phone, he is like an superstar: he has peaked. And the letter from Schaap and Ray show how desperate they are, playing Chomsky for all he's worth, but I think we are among the first on the left to realize that he isn't worth as much as we thought he was. I worked damn hard on him, as a friend, but he just wasn't listening. I hope he has the guts to admit it someday.

There was a guy at the COPA conference who said he made 650 copies of my article in *The Fourth Decade* ("Rethinking Chomsky") and handed it around at a talk Chomsky gave recently in Cambridge. That pleased me immensely, needless to say! I hope he passes on my Newman letter too.

Vince, thanks for that NYT book review on intelligence. Part of it was reprinted in the *International Herald Tribune*, but I am glad to have it all. I am using it as my first topic in one of my writing classes. In answer to your question, I tend to resist all attempts to define and measure "intelligence" rather fiercely. Show me the test and I'll show you plenty of reasons why it doesn't test anything important or conclusive enough to represent "intelligence." Actually, I thought that question had been settled, but here it is again in three "explosive" books.

As far as I'm concerned, the opinion poll just before the Gulf War that showed the majority of blacks and females against "intervention," and the slight majority of white males (as in Congress) for it, was as valid an intelligence test as any. When it comes down to it, your McGeorge Bundy types, with all their privileged upbringing and supposedly superior "intelligence," consistently choose the wrong box: war. That makes them much stupider than the ones who choose to avoid war. What good is IQ, however it is measured, if it leads to madness and destruction? A criminal can use his high IQ to kill people. Does that make him "intelligent"? I don't think so. Smart, clever, fast-thinking, manipulating, whatever, but not intelligent. IQ tests basically just measure how *fast* people can do certain tasks, mostly involving manipulating words or numbers or spatial figures. That is certainly only a small part of intelligence.

I applaud your renewed efforts to gain new members for our group. Hope Parenti joins.

As for me being too hard on Weisberg, Vince, you may be right. I admit that I don't like the man. My point about his book, though, was directed more at Carroll and Graf. I don't think they published his book in good faith. There is a point at which bad editing, or in this case no editing at all, cannot pass as "oversight." *Case Closed* goes way beyond that point. Have you actually tried to read the book? I would cite some passages but frankly I just don't have the energy to pick up that piece of trash again. It was like trying to read an essay by my worst students. Please don't compare yourself with him. There is no comparison. And please also stop this nonsense about your writing ability. You write very well and clearly, and what you have written is brilliant. Who else was writing such things in 1971? *That* is what I call intelligence.

Also on the subject of books, in Washington one of the working groups ("International Outreach") was headed by Al Navis, a Canadian bookseller, who knows all about the history of *Farewell America*. He told us the whole story, and I urged him to write it up. I hope he does. It was written by 2 British and one French intelligence officer on contract from RFK. The day after RFK received their report, he decided to run for president, that being the only way to fight what he now saw as the enemy. I've forgotten the details now of how it got published, but the last remaining 4,000 copies of it intended for distribution in the States ended up at an auction in Toronto. Navis got 2,000 and the CIA the other 2,000. Something like that. I'm sorry I can't remember the details, but the story sounded authentic, and the book has always seemed authentic to me–except for the fact that it doesn't mention the war, but it wouldn't be alone in that failing. It got the essential facts pretty much correct, though, in 1968, and it's simply astounding that it has gotten so little attention. It would be very worthwhile for somebody like you, Vince, who was in the thick of it at the time, to go back over that book in detail and re-evaluate it. It is full of names. Some of the people named would surely have sued if they (or somebody) wasn't afraid of the exposure.

In the middle of writing this I got a call from John Thomas all the way from the States, who said nice things about my letter to Newman. That made my day! John is good medicine. Bless you, John! This guy is full of infectious energy and enthusiasm. He wants to pursue a "Vietnam veterans outreach" angle in conjunction with COPA, which I think is a fabulous idea. That's where our priorities should be, on grassroots education and mobilization. John, I think the vet I talked with at the Wall, Ed Healey, was with Vietnam Vets of America. I would love to see those guys involved. The VVAW address (Ben Chitty) is VVAW, Clarence Fitch Chapter, PO Box 74, Van Brunt Station, Brooklyn, NY 11215, telephone 718-826-1789. They put out a newsletter called DMZ.

I bought a great book at the Wall, published by US Veteran News and Report. It cost 5 bucks and consists of 58,166 names. One reason I bought it was so the next time anybody asks me why I'm interested in the JFK assassination I can give them all 58,166 reasons.

Thinking about our conversation, John, I do think all 58,166 (and many more) were assassinated by institutional conspiracy, certainly not by "renegades" in the institutions. I don't understand why you would want to leave the CIA, or any other government institution, an escape hatch. They'll find their own escape hatch. Our job, as I see it, is to find out how those institutional conspiracies really work, so we can learn how to control them. (One way they work is by killing presidents and trying to keep it a secret.) If they can't be controlled (as, for example, the CIA has shown time and time again that it cannot be controlled) they should be destroyed.

This is not revolutionary chutzpah or destruction for destruction's sake; it's what I learned in school about how citizens are supposed to act in a democracy. We have to stop watching this shell game we call a government and letting those who run it steal our money and our lives. Either that or forget all this democracy shit. But in either case I want to at least understand the world I live in. Even the most miserable medieval slave or tenant farmer understood more about his world than we do about ours.

VS (11/17/94)

…[Mike says] he would like to see the proliferation of "Vince Salandria" groups. Mike, this is not my group. I am nothing more than the shipping clerk for a magnificent collection of fine people.

…Oct. 21, Ray Marcus praises Dick Levy for speaking against Marxists' view of the masses. I cannot consider myself a Marxist, mainly because I don't know what that term means precisely. But Marxian politics aside, with respect to the analysis of capitalism, for me Marx represents an analyst who was capable of coming upon and explicating great flashes of truth. And to the extent that Marxists seek to eliminate great extremes in wealth, I am much inclined to accept as a categorical premise that people should not be as rich as I am and as poor as the woman who sleeps on a grate sixty feet from my home and who has too much pride to accept money from me. To the extent that Marxists wish to expropriate my wealth and redistribute in accordance with need, I am with them.

Ray includes a long excerpt from a letter which he sent to Sylvia Meagher. Ray's letter takes Sylvia to task for her total rejection of Jim Garrison. His letter is representative of his amazing candor and courage. Sylvia jettisoned me as a friend when I offered assistance to Jim. She was quite willing to work with and to assist Jay Edward

Epstein, an obvious CIA asset, but cut me off because I felt Jim should be helped. I greatly missed her friendship.

…No one, but no one, is interested in my old pronouncements. If we are to publish anything, it should be the best of what you guys have produced in this correspondence, which I feel is among the best material written on the JFK assassination. If this correspondence shows anything, it demonstrates that good people, thinking fairly, and coming from different ideological directions, can through love of each other, respectfully exchange ideas and reach a solid consensus based on their mutually shared knowledge that the Kennedy assassination was a national security killing planned and executed at the behest of the United States military-intelligence-industrial power structure.

…Morrissey addresses the question of intelligence and asks whether Bundy could be considered intelligent since he has been wrong about such crucial matters as the Vietnam war. Mike, he is intelligent. He is never wrong. For his class, he always chooses the right block.

Morrissey hopes Parenti joins. He is joined until he resigns. We need him. I will put him to the trouble of telling me in writing that he doesn't want the material. Barring that, he is stuck with the job of chucking considerable paper.

Morrissey, I don't trust *Farewell, America*. When I was helping Jim Garrison, it appeared in his office. I thought it was unhelpful. My copy has gotten loaned out forever. I, therefore, have not read it in many years. I will try to pick it up again and reevaluate it. But, Mike, I would say that it is probably useless.

…Oct. 30, Parenti writes to Morrissey about the hypothesis that Newman may be an agent. Parenti met Newman in Washington and liked him very much. Morrissey on Nov. 5 replied to Parenti. I know something about the business of spy chasing in the critics' circles. Those of you who have known me over the thirty-odd years following the assassination know that I was surrounded by agents. And, as I have said in this letter, I never achieved any importance. Suffice it to say that any successful coup would not allow the analysis of that coup to operate freely without efforts to control and direct the criticism. In my judgment, this control of the criticism was in part made possible by the infiltration of the critical community by brilliant CIA agents. Some of our most respected critics are necessarily CIA agents.

…John Thomas feels that we should focus on Vietnam. John, I feel that Vietnam is of great importance in the assassination picture. But it is only one piece in a whole series of charges against Kennedy which constituted the bill of particulars that spelled out the cause for and justified in the minds of the power structure his murder….

MM (12/1/94)

Our humble "shipping clerk" asks us what we make of Lane's "association" with Liberty Lobby. I don't make anything of it, Vince, because I don't believe in guilt by association. Same goes for Prouty, whom I consider a friend. His remark about *The Spotlight* (if he really said it) seems exaggerated to me, but neither that nor having spoken at a Liberty Lobby meeting makes him one of "them," in my opinion. I've never heard or read anything from him that even remotely suggests that he shares the agenda imputed to Liberty Lobby. Until I do, he's innocent as far as I'm concerned.

Vince, I think I can help with the problem of redistributing your wealth. (You did say "millions" a year, didn't you?) As a matter of fact, I've always wanted to meet up with

a rich anarchist with a guilty conscience. Please send a bank draft or check for $1 million. Or at least a hot stock tip, or some sure-fire, high-yield investment opportunity that your big bucks give you access to. You'll feel better, I'm sure.

So far Parenti, Thomas, and Prouty are the only ones who have responded to my letter to Newman. (The latter two were positive.) Not a word from Newman or Peter Dale Scott. I thought these guys were scholars. If I got it wrong, you'd think they would be busting their butts to set me straight.

Vince, I cannot disagree more that "Vietnam is only one piece in a whole series of charges against Kennedy" that caused the assassination. What was more important–to the perpetrators–than a $570 billion war? What can be more important to *us* than 58,000 Americans, plus tens of thousands of others still suffering, plus millions of Asians? What in the world are you thinking of? Of course we should focus on the war. Nothing is as important.

I don't see the importance, however, of the Purcell/Galbraith article. (But thanks for sending it, John.) There is nothing surprising about military strategists calculating the pros and cons of a nuclear first strike. I'm sure they do it all the time. That's their job.

Ray, that was a beautiful letter you sent to Sylvia Meagher. Did you ever get any insight at all into her strange attitude toward Garrison?

At the risk of flattering you, as I did Vince, and again exposing the depths of my obsequiousness, I repeat that the early work, including private exchanges such as yours with Meagher, would make a fine book. A big part of this history, someday, after the truth comes out, is going to be the story of the early critics. How did they (or didn't they) escape the cover-up and mind control? Why those particular individuals? Furthermore, it would be heartening for people who find themselves faced with a similar situation to know that others have been there too, and how they coped. You might consider writing your memoirs.

John, I hope that $1000 you gave to COPA will at least be good for a tax write-off. Based on their response to my letter, I rate them now at 0.00 on a scale of ten, which rounded off comes to Fuck 'em. Nor have they sent me the $100 honorarium they promised me.

Great letter to the *Inquirer*, John. One question. You say all the video docs have the original Zapruder film. But I wonder if anybody knows where the "original" film is or what's on it. I believe a couple of frames are missing from the copies, and some people think the skin flap is phony (to show Oswald's bullet exiting?). An article in the paper a couple of weeks ago said "the" Zapruder film was just added to the national film registry at the Library of Congress. I wonder if that is the original.

Thanks, John, for going to the trouble of plotting out the various positions on the withdrawal thing. A couple of things in Illustration 1 need to be corrected.

1a. NSAM 263 was 10/11/63. The White House statement (referring to the McNamara-Taylor report of the same date) was 10/2/63. I think 1c belongs here (secret plan to withdraw regardless).

1b. Chomsky disagrees with Newman (no secret plan to withdraw).

1c. I agree with Newman that JFK probably knew the war was a lost cause, but I also agree with Chomsky that there is no evidence for this. I don't want to debate the point. This is the false debate.

2a. I'd have to check to see exactly when Newman says JFK turned negative, but I think he sees it earlier than this. The assassination of Diem just made it worse. Newman says JFK was just pretending to believe the optimistic reports.

2b. I don't think Chomsky says JFK ever changed his mind (or his policy). Chomsky does not differentiate JFK's secret thoughts from his stated policy, which was withdrawal on the assumption of military progress–which Chomsky insists on describing as "withdrawal on the *condition* of victory," which is significantly different, in my opinion. The point is, Chomsky is rebutting Newman's speculation about JFK's secret thoughts. That's the false debate.

2c. I say that–according to Chomsky–the reversal of the assessment and (consequently) the withdrawal began two days after the assassination (of JFK). The source of the reversal was CIA and the other intelligence agencies. Two days after JFK's death, they suddenly began to realize that they had been losing the war, instead of winning it, since July. I say this stinks. This is the point where the real debate should begin.

3a,b. I don't think either one says JFK gave such an order.

3c. Right. Furthermore, I doubt the authenticity of draft 273.

4a,b,c. NSAM 273 was 11/26/63. This is uncontroversial.

5a. Right.

5b. No. Just the opposite.

5c. I agree with Newman, but again, this is not the point I want to focus on. The fact is that 263 was reversed *at some point after* the assassination. It doesn't matter if it was 273 or 288 (at the latest).

6a. Sooner rather than "ultimately."

6b. Not irrelevant, but unlikely.

6c. I don't reject 6a (that JFK would have pulled out by 66 in any case), but of course it is unprovable. My point is that 6a is *unnecessary* to establish 5c, which is the important point.

The Time Line looks ok except for f), which should be 11/20/63, and h), which should be 11/26/63.

That was heavy exercise.

VS (12/14/94)

…I am listening to Michael Parent's tapes while I work out on my stationary bike. This one-man movement of the left does fine work.

…Dec. 1, Jerry Di Caprio gives the assassination cover-up an Italian twist. I think he is correct to do so. I recall meeting with my then brother-in-law, Harold Feldman, now deceased, on Saturday, Nov. 23, 1963. We were talking about Oswald. We decided that if he was killed in captivity that weekend, we would have work to do because this would indicate a WASP conspiracy involving the U.S. government. We thought that a Jewish assassin of Oswald would dampen the interests of normally skeptical and left-leaning Jews in investigating the assassination. As it turns out, Oswald and Ruby were perfect in pointing to the possible guilt of Communists, Trotskyites, ACLUers, the FBI informants, Mafiosi, pro-Castroites, low-level anti-Castroites, right-wing Russians nuts (Michael Paine told me that Oswald went to right-wing meetings with Oswald, who took careful notes regarding what was said there), Quakers, etc. The CIA computers sun these two

guys out as perfect for dampening the interest of almost any would-be investigators who had any political bases.

…The Nov. 23, 1994 article in The *Philadelphia Inquirer* speaks to the government's release of Milteer material. Isn't this more pointing of fingers in the direction of the right wing and away from the core of U.S. power?

…Dr. Michael Morrissey makes reference to "our humble 'shipping clerk.'" I detect that Dr. Morrissey is making light of my genuine modesty. Well, Dr. Morrissey, I am most proud to state that I am unquestionably more modest than you, and even more modest than any other member of this committee, and with considerably less reason for my modest than Professor Brown has for his lack of that attribute. As for a million-dollar bank draft, check or instrument of monetary value of any kind flying from me to you, there is little chance of such an unlikely occurrence since the esteem in which I hold you rises only slightly higher than that in which I hold Professor Brown and is fast falling to that lowest of levels.

1995

VS (1/30/95)

…I must agree with Marty and Ralph that the assassination of JFK cannot be used for progressive political organizational purposes. To the extent that we seek to use this case as a bridge or catalyst for political action, we will find ourselves being used by the CIA to confuse the truth about the motives behind, the significance of and the present relevancy of the JFK assassination to the current distribution of wealth in our society and in the rest of the world and the present significance of that assassination on the present and future state of democracy.

Marty reminds us that JFK was shot out of existence and everything went on without an apparent ripple. No one resigned from the government in protest. The military flexed its muscles and spewed death in Vietnam. Death squads trained by our intelligence butchered radicals around the world. The peace movement did not take up the Kennedy assassination. The civil rights movement did not take up the Kennedy assassination. The people in the United States did not want to know about the assassination, because it told too much about the underlying terror upon which American power is based. It told too much about the shabby state of American democracy.

The study of the JFK assassination in my judgment is important to build political coalitions but as a beam of light which reveals the depth of our corruption and the extent of depravity in seeking through violence to accomplish our purposes. Marty tells us that the president's murder was handled in a totally institutional and bureaucratic fashion. The people were willing to have it handled that way, because they did not wish to take to the streets and take down their government, which was steeped in the murder of its head of state and poised to commit millions of murders in Vietnam and elsewhere. This murder can only be used to examine the corruption of our society. It cannot be used for the building of political coalitions.

This case can only serve to make us feel humble. It can teach us the humility which will cause us to hesitate before we criticize the Cuban government for not being democratic. It can only cause us to look elsewhere in the world for forces which will

bring us down from our position of number one militarist of the world, down from our position as the world's number one fashioner of weapons systems, down from our position as the possessor of the world's foremost intelligence network, and down from our preeminent role in the economic exploitation of the world's peoples and resources.

Michael Parenti argues that we can consider ourselves as true patriots over the super-patriots who claim for themselves the high ground of true patriotism. Well, I speak for myself when I say that I do not claim to be a patriot. I am ashamed of being an American. And I am saying that as a citizen, not as an anarchist. For you probably have already detected about this anarchist that I am only an anarchist insofar as I believe, as Jefferson did, that that government is best that governs least. Logically, that leads to the conclusion that that government is best which governs not at all. But I recognize the problems of the human animal, of which I am one. I recognize that we must have some government. So, please don't dismiss what I am saying on the ideological basis that the old shipping clerk is a strange duck. I may be strange, but I do not consider it strange to express my personal shame at being an American.

How would you have felt about me if I had claimed to be patriotic, if I had been a German citizen and considered myself a German patriot during the Hitler period? Well, what we did to those millions of Vietnamese innocents smells of Hitler. What we are doing to Cuba smells of Hitler. What our death squads have done and are doing smells of Gestapo. Sorry, dear friends, you must recognize me for what I am, a non-patriot.

Who among you will answer Marty? What I am asking you to do is not easy. I am asking you to reexamine your very identity. If none of you answers, I will understand. I am not seeking to establish a cult of our group of friends. If we cannot come to grips with the issues Marty has raised for us, so be it. The correspondence will continue. We will still feel for one another.

MM (2/23/95)

Vince, your renewed call to redistribute "the wealth of this nation," presumably including your own, leads me to increase my offer to help. Although you kindly rejected my last offer, I will now accept $5 million (or more), preferably via a Swiss bank, since, sharing your anarchist principles, I don't want any fucking governments getting their hands on it. This means that both my wife and I will have to quit our jobs and probably buy a house someplace where the sun shines, but never mind, we'll manage.

Don't think I'm joking. You aren't, are you? If you can't accept my offer, I'd be very interested to know why not. Giving me money is the ideal way to solve your problem, in my opinion–and I won't even charge you for this advice.

Actually, Vince, your being a Rich Guy means nothing at all to me. I'm quite accustomed to corresponding with multimillionaires. Really. You're just plain ole Vince to me, man, the Most Humblest Person in the whole universe. I can't help it if I worship you.

Now on to Marty's question, before I get carried away. (I loves to grovel, makes me feel so secure.)

To continue Vince's analogy of the German "patriot" during the Hitler period, how would you feel about yourself, Marty, if you were a German then and you had said, "It's *irrational* to try to change things, since we know the chances of success are miniscule or non-existent?" The word that applies to the situation in Nazi Germany is not *irrational* but *dangerous*. It applies much less to our situation. We *can* speak out. We *can*

try to inform, persuade, organize, and mobilize others without risking life and limb. Why should it be any more "irrational" (as opposed to dangerous) to do so now than in Nazi Germany? It may well be a losing battle. So what else is new? I hear this from students all the time: "Even if it's true, there's nothing we can do about it." Marty says, "It *is* true, and there's nothing we can do about it." This is nothing more than defeatism and a rationale for choosing not to give a shit.

You might say that there is an alternative, a *healthy* alternative: Work for the Revolution! But how? The devil is in the details. Does this mean "*Wait* for the Revolution"? You seem to think, Marty, that it will emanate by some magical and clearly counterhistorical force from South Africa or Cuba. Even if the chances of this were better than nil, which they aren't, what would you have us do, exactly? Subscribe to *Granma*? Send money to Mumia Abu Jamal's defense fund? To the Cuban embassy? What cause? There are thousands. Contribute how much, to how many, to which ones, and in what way? Which will promote the Revolution more effectively than, say, joining COPA or trying to organize veterans? Whatever you say, it will be an equally small drop in the bucket–and equally "irrational," as you use the word.

In my opinion it is not only irrational but incredibly naive to cultivate this notion of Fidel Castro (God help us) or Nelson Mandela (less scary) riding in to save us on a white horse. Don't you get it? Hasn't Vince gotten through to you what anarchism is all about? ALL LEADERS ARE ASSHOLES! It goes with the job. We don't *want* leaders. And I don't want to rot in a goddam jail because I dare to disagree with what some fucking LEADER thinks, whether he's a Castro, a Clinton, a Chomsky, or a Chipmunk.

If a Revolution does come, whatever it happens to look like, you can bet it will be a completely staged affair, exactly like the so-called "revolution" in the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe. This is the kind of revolution that occurs when the Rich Guys get together and decide the other 99% of the global population has to be fucked and fooled in a different way, but fucked and fooled just the same.

I have no illusions about COPA. I enclose a copy of the talk I gave in Washington (slightly longer than what I actually said, since I stupidly stuck with the 15-minute time limit–nobody else did). [*See* Looking for the Enemy*, Ch. 1.1*. *--MDM*] Please note the last sentence. I also said in my letter to Newman that I have no faith at all in the paper chase. That does not mean, however, that I want to curl up and die, or give up and wait for the Revolution, or give up trying to expose the truth on JFK.

Your perception of the "macroanalysis" of this case is simply wrong. The connection between the assassination and the war, and thus the detailed discussion of the withdrawal plan reversal, is very much a part of the macroanalysis–a great big part. My challenge to Newman concerns this discussion as well as another big part of the macroanalysis, namely the question of how the current stage of the cover-up is being managed.

Your definition of the larger problem as "how do WE escape becoming unwitting agents of the CIA" is more than irrational. It makes no sense at all. Think about it. How can we escape becoming something ("unwitting agents") we would not recognize having become, after we become it?

I am rather disappointed that none of you, except John, seems to be interested in more than the most superficial aspect of what I wrote to Newman, namely that my questions might lead to mutual accusations and internecine warfare within this sacred

brotherhood of conspiracy researchers. Gimme a fucking break! I did not accuse him of anything. I gave him a opportunity to respond to perfectly justified questions, and if he was honest he would take the opportunity.

Newman is not just anybody. Do you think he just woke one morning at NSA and decided to become an assassination buff? This CRIES OUT for explanation, and his silence speaks volumes. He is an ex-spook leading the fight against the spooks. He says we'll never nail them as an institution, i.e., not *really*, but may get a few renegades. He writes a book about Vietnam from which the CIA emerges smelling like a rose, whereupon top spook William Colby praises the book as "brilliant" and "meticulously researched." At the same time, the book's extremely speculative thesis provides a perfect crash test dummy for Noam Chomsky, whose intervention effectively kills the whole issue of the assassination and the war for a crucial element of the population, namely "radical leftist dissidents" (many, anyway), who would otherwise be among the most likely to mobilize around such an issue.

Yet Marty, Ralph, and Michael Parenti all agree that I was a bad boy because this might start a "Who's the spook?" game. And our newest member, Robert Cocco, calls me "irresponsible" for "trashing" Chomsky (that is, for disagreeing with him), while Parenti scolds me for "salvaging" that same Great Mind by agreeing with him on some things.

Ok, guys, let's formulate the rules of this little game, shall we?

1. Do not challenge LEADERS, lest they challenge you (re Newman).

2. Do not disagree with LEADERS on one issue, if you agree with them on others (re Chomsky, Cocco).

3. Do not agree with LEADERS on one issue, if you disagree with them on others (re Chomsky, Parenti).

4. Should any of the above rules be broken, one may discuss the *propriety* of breaking the rules, but not, under any circumstances, the substance of the issues raised.

Go ahead and play if you like, but count me out.

VS (3/4/95)

[Brown] addresses a question to me about Joachim Joesten. I knew him by his occasional phone calls from Europe. I did not know that he wrote a book on the Shaw trial. Joesten impressed me as a man who sought the truth. I think I have essentially all his books.

…Frankly, guys, I know that you are split on Newman, but I have a need to know why an intelligence guy, while still in intelligence, is permitted to write about affairs of state of the importance as the killing of Kennedy? Even the American intelligence community cannot appear to be that democratic and retain the necessary element of state terror which is required to make it the effective agency it would have to have been and would have to be to accomplish what we know it has accomplished, and what we know it is doing now to prevent the truth from outing on the JFK and other CIA assassinations. What is going to explain the CIA's tolerance of Newman, if he in fact is what he appears to be? What explains Newman's departure from service to the state as an intelligence officer? What happened to him to change him? Doesn't he have to explain how and why he changed his allegiance? If he doesn't explain, doesn't that in itself provide volumes of explanation?

…I consider Morrissey a person of substantial courage to have said no to Vietnam. Turning one's back on the herd is a terrifying act, and to risk having it trample

over you is an act of great courage. I still cringe at the thought of doing it. Come on, Mike, you have every reason to be proud of opting out that butcher shop.

…Feb. 27, Brown debunks the application of "newer scientific methodology" to the study of the JFK killing. I, on this score, agree with Marty that the holes in the garments are enough. Ralph, Kennedy's shirt certainly couldn't have creased and folded upward, even if you argue that the coat could have done so. And how could the holes have been precisely where they were and conforming exactly to where Seibert and O'Neil, Clint Hill, etc. said that they were? And let us say all of the above witnesses, and the holes, and the pristine condition of CE 399, and the reports of the witnesses other than secret service agents who reported more than three shots, and shots from areas other than the TBD, and the primitive nature of the Carcano rifle and its defects, and the Zapruder film's recording of the president's body having been propelled by impact forces leftward and backward, were not conclusive of a conspiracy when analyzed later. But, on the evening of Nov. 22, 1993, an innocent government would have signaled to the whole world that there was a conspiracy based on the holes alone, let alone all the other evidence, arguendo all of which was mistakenly pointing to conspiracy, and would be proven to be mistaken later. But the patterns of evidence pouring in at that time, flush up against the assassination, HAD TO SIGNAL CONSPIRACY.

…Finally, I address Dr. Morrissey's plan for beginning the equal and equitable redistribution of the wealth of our nation by transferring to him five million dollars plus fifty-five per cent gift tax from my wife's funds. Of course, Dr. Morrissey, before I write the check, I will have to consult with Betsy. Betsy will no doubt inquire "Why *him*?" I intend to explain to Betsy that Dr. Morrissey promises to give up his work and promises to add himself to the class of the idle rich. I intend to tell her how that switch will help to produce better balance in reducing by one Michael Parenti's working persons' column and by adding Dr. Morrissey's disquieting presence to Parenti's enemy camp, the much smaller camp of those who live off the labor of others.

To you, Dr. Morrissey, I direct the question, what mean spirit causes you to launch your attack on the bonafides of my modesty which transcends my considerable talents. What cruel streak in you causes you to attack your old shipping clerk, who is the 67th year of his life teeters uncertainly at the very lip of his grave? Is an attack on this old clerk not only a display of your contempt for the aged but also a testament to your hatred of the proletarian class which your clerk exemplifies. Dr. Morrissey, at some future time, I will impart to you Betsy's response to your modest proposal to this modest clerk. In the interim, may this old shadow of a man presume on your good nature and offer you some advice? If I were so lucky as to be you, I would not just yet sell my home and give up my academic tenure.

MM (3/13/95)

Your reference to my attack on that aged Italian peasant teetering on the lip of his grave was withering, and I can see I am going to have to handle this differently. Enclosed is a letter from $crounge, an alter ego of mine that unfortunately I cannot get rid of.

March 13, 1995

Most Highly Esteemed and Gracious Majestic Prince:

Your (almost) humblest and unworthy servant is unspeakably honored and grateful from his heart's bottom for your magnanimous offer to convey in even more majestic quarters his lowly and miniscule tiny nothingness of a desire to assist you in

your desire to divest you of them heavy bucks that plagues you, a burden that your specklike minion me will gladly accept, as a grain of sand accepts that tiny particle of the sacred sea that whacks upon the shore. (Better make it 10 million if Uncle Sam's gonna get half.)

You hath asked of course fully righteously why him. I dont really have no answer to that but I'll do my bestest because as HM Nixon used to say when the going gets tough the tough get going and as I told Ira my Boy scout leader or was it Cub scouts I'll do my best to do my duty to God and my country which I also done nigh-on ever day by prayin and pledgin to that flak what is the cymbal of our cuntry, inderisible and underground wit libertidinus and just tea for all, as are forefadders showed the bastards in Boston way back.

Well one thing I can say is that I asked for it. Mr. Black whom was my boss for a couple days when I was trying to sell advertising for the St. Petersburg Chamber of Commerce said and he was a real wise guy that some guys are so stupid that they talk and talk and talk and talk and then forget to ask for the fucking order, scuse me. He also said never buy a silk suit because it gets so crumply which I never done and if he lived here (there) he'd fuck himself to death because of all the beach life. He was a real man from Texas and I never did sell nuthin but nor did I forgit his good advise which you can see.

Nother thang is, I'll do anythang you want, long as it's within my habilities acourse. Don't know if I'd kill anybody cause I hain't done it before but the Class has other people for that and I wit my high edjucation I could be one of them intillexuals what advises people and all, you know an opinion maker. Like in are group which is prolly more importent than its size would indicate I could keep some of them in line by chastigating them fer attacking the Agency and good ossifers like Major Newman who like me only done what his ma told him and pleged a legiance to are beaudiful flak what still flies lord be praised over are rapacious skies and ample raves of gain. scuse me fer gettin motional but when I think of all them young boys what died fer people like that, I mean traitors and ingrates that don't know or do nuthin but write letters I git sick, really sick. The Class oughter jes wipe em out but that ain't democratic so we'll tollerate em but keep em contained like in these little pen pal groups, right?

See I unnerstan these thangs cause blieve it or not I'm sorta in the Class too leastwise a little since I was in Delta Phi at Hopkins which is a Class frat. stupidly I quit when I got sucked into going to those SDS meets wit my roommate Steve who had cerebral palsy which shows you what kind do that, but I magine I could reactivate my memership. see they had two types a members, Class guys and literati and I made it on the latter cause I wrote a couple poms my freshman year an Arnie Lehman liked me. He got a Karman Ghia one Christmas from his parents which surprised him cause he thought they'd never buy anything from krauts and he's now director of the Balto Musée Dart. Haven't been in touch wit him since then but maybe he'd recommend me again. I can say dat while I wuz wit dem I did feel part of dem, above it all and all dat, which is wat keeps art and the Class together as it always has been, right, all the way back to Bach and Michael Angelo and them guys.

Well I don't wanna talk yer ear off, Your Highness, but if there's anythang else you wanna no before you send that check, jes say so, an by the way about that gift tax since when does the fucking scuse me goverment tell the Class what to do.

Your ever obedient and faithful servant,

$crounge

MM (3/19/95)

I'd like to say a word about my relationship with Fletch Prouty. I've only met him twice, once last October at the COPA conference and once in February 1990 when I visited him at his home in Alexandria, but I've carried on a fairly extensive correspondence with him since September 1989. I was very impressed with his appearance in the Turner film, and I got his address from Sue Winter, Turner's assistant. Vera and I spent a nice evening with them over an Indian meal in London during the Easter vacation in 1989. I didn't learn an awful lot from them, but it was my first contact with people who shared my suspicions of the truth about the assassination, and these were of course the two who were most responsible for the birth of those suspicions.

I wrote a review of the film that April (never published), which I enclose, not because there's anything new in it but because for me at least it's kind of a museum piece, written by somebody whose total knowledge of the subject was what was in the film and David Scheim's *Contract on America* (in Britain titled *The Mafia Killed President Kennedy*, for some reason). [*See* Looking for the Enemy*, Addendum 8. --MDM*]

I still think the suppression of this film in the US for three years, and its final appearance on A&E cable in September 1991, after it had been shown in 50 other countries and just three months before Stone's *JFK* was released, is one of the best proofs of media complicity in the cover-up and in the orchestration of the damage-control scenario which surrounded the Stone film. The purpose and effect of this timing was to bury the Turner film under the wave of controversy engendered by the Stone film.

The media were prepared to handle *JFK*, which they could accuse–wrongly but effectively–of "dancing with facts," but this strategy wouldn't have worked as well with the Turner film. I've shown both of these films to people who hadn't seen either one, and the Turner film definitely is more disturbing. And since I know what effect it had on me (I think this comes through in the review), I feel certain it would have had a comparable impact on other Americans. I've read occasionally of similar reactions to the Stone film, but frankly I haven't experienced them personally.

If the German reaction is indicative of anything, *JFK* has had virtually no impact. Most of the students I talk to who have seen it didn't even get the main point–that JFK was killed because of Vietnam. Of course this is less a failure of the film itself than a result of the media campaign to suppress the message. There were no headlines in any of the reviews I read, either in English or in German, that said "Film Claims JFK Murdered Because of Vietnam Withdrawal Plan" or the like. In fact, all references to Vietnam, if there were any at all, were carefully placed in the middle of the articles so as to attract as little attention as possible.

After I saw *JFK* here in Kassel, in January 1992, I said to Vera afterwards: "If this doesn't do it, nothing will." I meant that it should bring people out on the streets. She agreed. "But you know what the other side of that is," I said. "I'm not the only one who's saying this. What's going to be the result if nothing *does* happen? Total resignation, that's what. It'll either be revolution, or the opposite." I'm afraid I was right. There was no revolution, and the general resignation, cynicism and feeling of powerlessness I think has increased.

This is only logical. If a movie like this can't stir things up, at least not enough to make any difference, what can? Who wants to write articles or books or make films or

even talk about it any more, after Stone has flashed the message across the silver screen as loudly, and presumably as effectively, as it could possibly be done? I think Time Warner and the mind control smarties at Langley had this under control from the beginning.

Stone was used. We've talked about this before. I think he was sincere, but as Marty said some time ago, he made the mistake afterwards of falling into the "fight for full disclosure" trap, which has resulted in nothing but this phony COPA effort led by Major John Newman, who is going to absolve the US government and those institutions and individuals really responsible by blaming everything on "renegades" within the military and intelligence establishment. They want "full disclosure" from the government which they know is responsible for crimes they cannot possibly admit to, and yet are apparently offended and shocked into silence by a mere letter from me, a COPA member, asking for "full disclosure" from Major Newman himself. Peter Scott, who has made much of the Vietnam connection that my questions are vitally concerned with, cannot or will not respond either. Oliver Stone does not respond. No one responds. Except Prouty. He says I hit the nail right on the head and if they don't answer, that should tell me something.

So this is a guy I'm supposed to be suspicious of because he is quoted occasionally in *The Spotlight* and talks on Tom Valentine's radio show, or because he is retired military, or because Noam Chomsky says he is a "raving fascist" and a "fraud" but refuses to explain why he thinks so?

I've told Prouty more than once that his "association" with *The Spotlight* and Liberty Lobby, however loose, does him no good, but his attitude is people are going to think of him what they want to think, regardless. He is not a great scholar, and much of what he says is based on personal experience, which impresses some people (like me) but can be easily dismissed as "anecdotal" by people who won't believe anything that isn't footnoted, i.e. hasn't been said by a bunch of people before, as if that made it any more credible.

I read in a biography of Lansdale (forget by whom) that Lansdale, who knew Prouty and worked with him, considered Prouty a kook (after Prouty started voicing his theories, of course) and remarked: "I sure can pick 'em, can't I?" That's a pretty good recommendation for Prouty, I would say. As for the *Spotlight* connection, I think Prouty is a guy who likes attention (and deserves it), and since they have given it to him, he has acquiesced. A forum with them is better than none at all, I think he figures. I no longer subscribe to *The Spotlight*, because it does have anti-Semitic, racist, and nationalistic tendencies, and despite the fact that it also publishes interesting and gutsy stuff, it's not very usable. Their documentation is poor, and you can't quote them or even refer to them without being stamped as a "raving fascist" yourself. But I'll be damned if I'm going to let my opinion of someone be determined by the color of the newspaper his picture or an interview with him appears in. I'll go by what the man says and writes, and having read a good bit of what Prouty has said and written, I can say that none of it strikes me as even remotely anti-Semitic, racist, or nationalistic. His world view, in my opinion, is very close to Chomsky's–and my own: the Rich Guys rule. He chooses to call it the High Cabal, and Chomsky calls it corporate interests, etc., but it is the same thing as far as I can see.

Before I managed to get Prouty's address, I got Oliver Stone's address from *Who's Who* and wrote to him, including my review of the Turner film and suggesting he look into it because the whole thing, I thought, had a "hell of a lot to do with Vietnam." He wrote back, amazingly enough (July 14, 1989): "Thank you for your letter. I will look for the film you mention, but I am fully occupied now with three films and cannot pursue."

By July of the following year (1990), however, he had contacted Prouty, as I learned from Prouty, since we were corresponding by then. Since Prouty figures prominently in my review as well as in the film itself, and since Stone obviously didn't know about either at that point (unless he was being disingenuous with me), I suspect that I might have had something to do with getting him and Prouty together. I wrote to Stone a couple of times after that, most recently when I sent him a copy of my Newman letter, but he has never written again. Maybe he figures I would try to get a piece of his pie or something. I'll have to set $crounge on him.

Vince, if you feel so inclined, I think Prouty would be a positive addition to our group. He's about 80 and I haven't written to him a lot recently, but I think he would actively participate, which is more than I can say for some of the members who prefer to "lurk" while just a few of us hang our guts out on the line. At least this would provide anyone who harbors suspicions of him to voice them openly and get a response. I don't think he will mind if I give you his address: Col. L. Fletcher Prouty, 4201 Peachtree Place, Alexandria, VA 22304, tel. 703-751-9080.

My instincts and experience are that Fletch is ok and belongs with us–not only ok but deserving of the encomium that Stone gave him. I haven't changed my opinion of him since I first saw him in the Turner film. Chomsky, by contrast, as you know, has been a great disappointment, and this is not my imagination. I have a stack of letters from Prouty and a stack of letters from Chomsky over more or less the same time period, and if I were at liberty to disclose them, I think anyone would see clearly that Chomsky comes up very short by comparison. "You will know them by the kind of letters they write to nobodies like me"–somebody should have said that somewhere–"and also by the letters they *don't* write to nobodies like me," I would add.

VS (4/13/95)

…Mar. 10, Michael Parenti thanks us for the material. He spanks Mike Morrissey lightly for saying that Michael Parenti was of the opinion with regard to Professor Chomsky that we cannot agree with a leader on one issue, if we disagree with him on other issues. Did our Mike say that? If he did, then please accept our apologies for a slip of the mind. I have enclosed some blurbs on Michael Parenti's books. He is so worth reading and listening to on his tapes. If he were not so brilliant in his writing and speeches, his fine sense of humor should demand that we get all of his works.

…March 13, $crounge, a split from Mike's personality, writes to me about the redistribution of wealth. This $crounge can handle the language and knows how to make a pitch. He seems to have the qualities of a Mark Twain. I have fallen in love with his charm. I am going to get around to talking to Betsy and putting the question to my good wife, "Why not him? Why not $crounge?"

…Ralph Brown encloses some pages from Joachim Joesten's *The Trial of Clay Shaw*. I heard from Joesten early in the case. He called me a couple of times. There is no question as to his being a bone fide hunter after the truth of the JFK assassination. His criticism of Jim Garrison's case? After Jim showed me what he had in the way of

evidence, I did not think he had a prayer of convicting Shaw. I was also absolutely certain that Jim had the right man in Clay Shaw as having had a minor role in the assassination. It is just that the courtroom is no place to do winning battle with the national security state apparatus that killed Kennedy and controlled the reporting, discussion and writing on the assassination. I know a psychiatrist who treated a patient who reported in his therapy sessions that he had sex with Clay Shaw and Oswald together. The psychiatrist knew Shaw and Garrison quite well. He was no fan of Garrison. Joesten apparently did not come to understand that courtrooms are the last places where you can arrive at truth and justice when the head of state was killed by a covert executive arm of the national security state. Ralph recommends *JFK: The Second Plot* by Matthew Smith. I bought it on Ralph's recommendation, but I would respectfully disagree with Ralph on its value.

Mar. 23, Mike encloses letter of Feb. 9 from Professor Chomsky, Mike's response of Feb. 21, and Professor Chomsky's letter of March 13 in reply. I enclose Ray Marcus' letter of April 14 [18?], 1969, which locks Professor Chomsky into another position on the assassination. I also enclose the Nov. 22, 1963 memo from J. B. Donahoe to Delmont regarding Deputy Attorney General de Katzenbach's efforts to zero in on Oswald as the assassin. I also enclose de Katzenbach's memo to Moyers of November 25, 1963 to close in on Oswald as the lone assassin. Please note the Dec. 9, 1963 memo from de Katzenbach to Warren in which he treats Warren as someone of no account who is being told what he is to find in the JFK killing, i.e. that Oswald did it and did it alone.

What would Professor Chomsky in his search for verification of historical records demonstrating a conspiracy have to say about this shameful treatment of the Chief Justice by the person who was supposed to be working for the brother of the assassinated head of state? I also enclose a batch of letters seeking to obtain the tape of the radio communications to Air Force One and to the Cabinet plane from the Situation Room of the White House as the aircraft made its way from Dallas and over the Pacific on the afternoon of Nov. 22, 1963. What would Prof. Chomsky have to say about how the Pentagon lies about that tape? Are these governmental officials closing all options other than the Oswald single assassin concept to cover for some right-wing or left-wing nuts? A spin-off from an intelligence agency? Castro. The Soviets? The Mafia? A disgruntled husband or husbands? Any candidate other than the very dark heart of the national security state?

…In accordance with the request of Mike Morrissey I am sending this material to Fletcher Prouty. Mr. Prouty, please drop me a note to indicate whether or not you wish to receive future mailings.

VS (5/4/95)

…Ralph mentions I.F. Stone and his lecturing to Bertrand Russell on the assassination. I visited my father-in-law, Morris Rodman, in Washington D.C. He has all the volumes of the I.F. Stone newsletter. They are bound and each volume is inscribed by Stone with an acknowledgement and fawning thanks to Gertrude and Morris Rodman for their financing of his newsletter. Yet in the biographies which I read, Izzy complains about visiting rich men and getting next to nothing for his newsletter. There was no public acknowledgement of Roddy's support. I also came across Betsy's diary when she was turning 15. There are references to Izzy and his wife visiting with the Rodman family. Betsy remembers him as a "not very warm person." M.S. Arnoni, the publisher of *The Minority of One* described Stone to me as "a fine reporter who served as the

journalist for the left wing of the Establishment. Fine on reporting, not so great on analysis."

…April 18, 1995. Fletcher Prouty writes a letter and accepts the burden of receiving our material. He also includes what I consider to be a most enlightening piece on the meaning of the POW/MIA phenomenon. I don't know what Fletch's politics are, but considering what this man has done to raise the political understanding of this country, I don't care. My only misgiving about Fletch is his admiration of Morrissey. $crounge's winning ways I can appreciate and admire, but the host personality of $crounge, Morrissey? Fletch, Morrissey is such a pain in the posterior.

April 29, 1995, Brown speaks of Norman Mailer and his new book about the "mystery" of Oswald in the Soviet Union. Since I have taken to shameless name-dropping in this letter, permit me to share with you Mailer's second wife Adele's feelings about him. Adele was the one with whom he had three children. She was stabbed by him, the knife coming to rest a fraction of an inch from her heart. Betsy and I have become friends of hers. When I asked her what she could say about "Norman's integrity," Adele replied, "He has none."

…Finally, some angry words with Parenti. In one of your tapes you speak about coming from Southern Italian parents. I challenge you. I come from two immigrant parents both from the tiny Calabrian town of Rocca Imperiale. Can you beat that in terms of Southern Italian? I am willing to bet you a quarter that we were poorer than your family. I just don't appreciate one of the correspondents seeking to outdo me in terms of modest origins.

MM (5/5/95)

Thanks for giving Prouty a chance to join us. I hope he does.

Enclosed is Chomsky's reply (4/3/95) to my last letter. Note that:

1. My rather harsh remarks seem to have rolled off him like water off a duck's back.

2. The only point he responds to (re Prouty) is the one least relevant to the main issue (when the assessment changed).

3. His reference to the book explains nothing, since his comments there about Prouty are very mild and no comparison to what he said in his letters.

4. Nevertheless, he implies that I am too stupid to have noticed the relevant section of his book, and too stupid to know that the book has an index. If the man had real arguments, would he have to stoop to this?

5. The comment that I have no respect for "fact" is intriguing, since the facts I asked him to confirm were things he wrote himself.

It's astonishing to see Ray making much the same arguments to Chomsky way back in 1969 that I have made to him. Chomsky's aversion to "conspiracy theory" (and common sense) is obviously of long standing, as is his aversion to rational discussion–despite what he preaches in his books. His idea of discussion is to ignore his opponent's arguments and repeat his own. If you persist, he writes you off. This is what he has done to me. Not once has he responded reasonably to any of my arguments, and bear in mind that what we are both primarily interested in is establishing "the facts." Obviously, he thinks "facts" are something given–to him. I wouldn't have been surprised at this behavior had it come from *anybody* but Noam Chomsky.

I know Michael Parenti agrees with Chomsky on many things. So do I. I was exaggerating, of course, when I formulated those "rules of the game" in my letter of 12/23/94. I was reacting to Parenti's implication that I was somehow "salvaging" Chomsky's research, when he said:

One could play that game with you: What would serve the CIA more than to enlist someone as sharp as Morrissey to take out Newman, who is hated by his former military intelligence colleagues as a turncoat critic. It is odd that Morrissey–under what better guise than purporting to be totally critical of the CIA and the intelligence community–*salvages Chomsky's research*, and creates divisive feelings and suspicions by casting doubt not only on Newman's argument but his integrity and motives, etc. etc. (10/30/94, my emphasis).

Now that I have quoted this passage, I'd like to ask Michael how he knows that Newman "is hated by his former military intelligence colleagues as a turncoat critic." And, Michael, if you think it's true, why do you think it is significant, when it is obvious, isn't it, that agents posing as critics would get flak from the Agency (or NSA or whatever) as part of the charade?

Thanks for the complement, but I am obviously not sharp enough to "take out" Newman. In fact, I'm not even sharp enough to get an answer from him, or from Scott or Judge or DiEugenio or Aguilar or Bill Davis or Al Navis or anybody else on the COPA governing or advisory board I sent the letter to, except you.

I don't think it is any wiser to ignore our mutual suspicions than it is to exaggerate them, especially when it comes to individuals in key positions. Perhaps you should ask Vince if it would have been good to know that the CIA had agents on Garrison's staff. Or ask Gaeton Fonzi if he would like to have known from the beginning that Blakey was going to thwart the House investigation (and why would he do that unless he was an agent?).

Given the obvious interest of the government in obstructing this investigation, I see no reason to leave unchallenged a man who has already announced–with no justification–that the end result of the investigation will probably be that there was and is no institutional conspiracy but perhaps a conspiracy of rogues. If this is true, of course, we can just get rid of the bad eggs (or wait till they die) and everything will be fine. We might even have to get rid of the CIA entirely to give the rest of the intelligence community (e.g., NSA, Newman's ex-employer) a clean bill of health. This is the only way the power structure as a whole can remain intact.

I did not attack Newman's integrity or motives. Why is asking a retired intelligence officer if he is still bound by secrecy oaths an attack on his integrity? Don't you think a man purporting to lead a campaign against government secrecy should be honest enough to say whether he is still bound by secrecy oaths that we know very well he has made to that very government? If Newman is honest, none of my questions should have been difficult or embarrassing for him to answer. He should have jumped at the chance to enhance his credibility.

My questions about the withdrawal issue remain unanswered. Newman has ignored them. Chomsky has ignored them (in effect). Peter Scott has ignored them. You have ignored them. At the time, you hadn't even read Newman's book, but you felt justified in admonishing me for expressing my "ad hominem" suspicions, which is both

inaccurate and unfair. You did not answer my reply (11/5/94) to your letter. So yes, I was being provocative. Does it surprise you?

Vince, concerning your attempt to track down that tape of communications between the White House and the Cabinet plane on Nov. 22, did you ever write back to White and prod him for more details? Not that it would do any good. I wrote to Schlesinger about the phone calls he describes in *A Thousand Days* that resulted in the cancellation of the Bay of Pigs air strikes. He described them narratively, as if he'd been there, and this was one of the questions I asked him, but he apparently couldn't remember. "I am too busy to refresh my memories of Bay of Pigs details," he replied. Doesn't it make you wonder what he would have to do to "refresh" his memory?

The Joesten material Ralph sent is very interesting. Did Garrison ever reply to these criticisms? Why, indeed, would Garrison claim that Oswald met Perry Russo at Ferrie's apartment if Garrison knew that this "Oswald" was an imposter? Why in the world did he claim that Oswald took a rifle with him to the Depository, when even the Warren Commission couldn't establish that? Why did he decide not to call the Connallys as witnesses? Why did he accept the government's refusal to release the autopsy materials? Why did he rest his case prematurely? Why didn't he call those other dozen witnesses?

It is clear that, as Vince says, Garrison bit off more than he could chew, but why would he chew less vigorously than he could have? I'd like to hear Ralph's thoughts on this. Ralph, you say it was a "common allegation of the day that Garrison sabotaged his own case to aid the CIA and discredit other researchers." I haven't heard this before. Who said this? Joesten doesn't go quite that far, but he does suggest Garrison might have made a deal. Why would he have done so? Was that also Sylvia Meagher's quarrel with Garrison?

I suppose Marty and Vince, as subscribers to *Granma*, have seen their Feb. 25 interview with Ramsey Clark. I ran across it on the Internet. He decries the use of sanctions as a weapon, and concludes:

The need we all have for the years ahead is to find ways to share the truth and work together to prohibit the United States government from any use of its military technology against any people anywhere, and to reverse its economic policy, which is designed to enrich the plutocracy, the rich in the US. Otherwise we will see a growing gap between the rich and the poor, which has been growing steadily within both the US and other rich countries against their own poor and against the poor people of all poor countries, and completely reverse that US policy to seek to greatly increase the share available to impoverished peoples. Otherwise we are heading for a catastrophe of unimaginable proportions. *The United States is not a "democracy.". It is a plutocracy. It is government by wealth* [my emphasis–and my sentiments, exactly!]. You can't understand the US unless you understand this. The plutocracy controls the military and the media and that has to be changed. We have to liberate the United States from the control of the plutocracy. We have an enormous number of poor who must be cared for with a fairer wealth distribution. US plutocrats must be prevented from devising means like GATT and NAFTA, which ensure a massive future catastrophe.

This guy has obviously gone through some changes since he was Attorney General. I'd like to know his current views on the assassination. On the other hand, what

does it matter? When a guy like that says the US is a plutocracy, what else needs to be said? The catalogue of the plutocracy's crimes is large enough.

I hope nobody misinterprets this, but I suspect this is exactly the way the Oklahoma City bombers feel, and the way millions of Americans (not to mention the rest of the planet) feel. The disaffection with government, especially the US government, is deep-seated and widespread, much more so than the mass media will admit. I think we all know this. It is no wonder that these feelings of powerlessness result in violence.

On the other hand, Oklahoma City may have been the work of the CIA. Notice how quick the media were to put our "civil liberties" up for grabs as a result of this event. How many Oklahoma Cities would be necessary to justify the imposition of martial law and an overt police state? Not many. They can do this literally anytime they wish. Just imagine. One more Oklahoma City, or to clinch it, two more, simultaneously in two places. An obvious terrorist conspiracy. Think of the lengths the government could go to to counter this "terrorism," and without much protest from either the media or the population at large.

Ralph: If you get involved with the document review process you may get a chance to see at closer hand how the charade is managed. As for John Judge, I am not impressed. He never did cough up that $100 that Gary Aguilar promised me as an honorarium, and he did not respond at all to my letters–either to the Newman letter or the separate one to him suggesting an electronic mailing list. He hasn't even provided a complete list of COPA participants with addresses. How much trouble would that have been–to collect and distribute our addresses (especially e-mail)? This man is concerned about "grass roots"?

I finally got hold of the Posner book, and haven't read it yet, but what he says on p. xv rings true:

Not only am I familiar with the content of many [of the government files] already released, but I have spoken to individuals who are familiar with the still-classified documents. None of the government documents to be released alters the judgment reached in *Case Closed*.

Of course, this may be a lie, but common sense tells me it is true. This paper chase cannot be anything but an extension of the cover-up. The only hope is that someone directly involved might find an opportunity to demonstrate the fact.

VS (6/16/95

…Mike encloses Prof. Chomsky's latest letter, which is completely devoid of civility and reason. He questions Newman's work. I saw his new book in a book store. Bad! Mike, I make judgments about whether members of the critical community are agents. More important, however, is to determine whether a critic, whether an actual agent or not, does work which serves the interest of American intelligence. That question I pose about everyone who does any work and most specifically, pose to myself about any work I have done.

Mike, on Garrison, he did not sabotage his own case. Garrison was a giant of a man, but he had great weaknesses. One of his weaknesses was not that he would have deliberately lost the Shaw case. The Shaw case was unwinnable. No matter how well he and his staff prepared it, the power behind the assassination would never have permitted Shaw to be prosecuted successfully. I knew the case could not be won by the prosecution. I strongly suspected that Garrison also knew. Given the rules of evidence, given the

limitations of funds, given the infiltration of the staff, given the ability of the government to bribe, threaten, cajole or to kill potential witnesses, jurors, staff members, the judge, what had to have been done would have been done to defeat Garrison. I think Jim knew that. Jim fatalistically went in and took his beating. I was with him after we received the verdict. He said simply, "Now, everyone will know who I am." He consciously or unconsciously identified with LHO. Jim was a patsy who took the government's punishment for me, and for all of us.

Mike, Ramsey Clark, Clark said while he was Attorney General that he might have to arrest Garrison. I have an idea that his turn around is in part due to guilt that he feels about that public statement.

…May 5, 1995 John Thomas speaks of L.W. Alvarez and Paul Hoch. Paul Hoch and I go back to 1965. I place no trust in Hoch whatever. His newsletter is ridiculous. How can a person pretend to be objective about the assassination who finds every item of evidence equivocal? He is clearly not stupid. Then why does he allow himself to be placed in positions where he invariably demonstrates that he chooses to embrace a stupid position?

April 5, 1995, Marty speaks out on what the assassination means to him. This commentary of Marty I consider to be marvelous in terms of the light it casts on the assassination of Kennedy and its current importance to our society. In short, Marty believes that Kennedy's efforts to live with a command economy such as that of Cuba and have the market-oligopolistic-postindustrial capitalistic giant compete with this alternative economic form in a peaceful manner caused him to be assassinated.

I recall that earlier in this correspondence a discussion of command versus market economies was irrelevant to a discussion of the killing of Kennedy. I believe I was wrong.

I am reminded that in summer of 1965 I went to Dallas. I went with Shirley Martin, an early assassination critic. I met her in Hominy, Oklahoma, where she lived. We started to drive and were stopped by the local police, who asked: "Mrs. Martin, we see you are on your way on a trip. Drive carefully."

We got to Dealey Plaza at 6:30 A.M. A stout man of about 55 years of age, wearing sandals on bare feet, approached me.

"How is Mark Lane?" he asked. "Do you know what this is?"

"Dealey Plaza," I dumbly replied.

"No, do you know what it is?" he repeated.

"I guess I don't," I said.

"Well, this is a WPA project. A socialist project where a socialist president was killed. Next time you write articles, mention that."

Then he began to educate me on the holocaust. "You know, the killing of the Jews was a historical accident. They just happened to be living in ghettos and by accident were killed because they were so densely occupying those areas."

He then walked away.

We proceeded to visit with Michael and Ruth Paine. It was supposed to be a surprise. Shirley knew the Paines, but they were not supposed to have known that I was coming or to have known who I was. But Michael greeted me with "Why don't you continue your work in civil liberties and civil rights. Why bother with the assassination?"

We then visited with Marguerite Oswald. Her financial circumstances seemed to have improved over the prior summer when we visited with her. Shirley talked with her privately and told me that she had been given money by persons who were interested in her welfare.

On the way back, Shirley began to attack me for the first time. She said that she would give up the work on the assassination, if she were provided with enough money so that she could raise horses. On the way back to Hominy, just as we were getting home, very tired and driving slowly, a police car signaled us to pull over.

"Mrs. Martin, you were speeding," the policeman said. We got a ticket for speeding when we were barely crawling.

Money, socialism, capitalism are all very relevant.

MM (6/17/95)

Majestic Munificence:

Well heh heh I must say I yam flattered heh heh to have such "winning ways" heh heh. I guess I can speck a check chop chop then, huh? Never mine no burden is too great. Rilly though you oughtter go ahead an ax her cause who nose how long I'll be here. An then where will yer Highness be? Up a tree. Nobody to give dat dough to but all them sickiefants. Plus the wife (mine) is hot to move to Arizona.

Is there words to describe it? Dat scum you write to. Why do you do it, Grace? You was meant for better things. One of em don't even *live* in America! Nother one hands out speeches by Fidel Castro. They pass around letters written by *young boys*, still in high school! Cheezus. Dont git drug down by such as that, Prince. Git away!

Marsey is the worst, you couldn be righter, Munificence. This is *real* low trash. Lord hep me should I git my hands around his neck. I haint at liberty to say everthang I could about him cause unfortunely he's got the upper han at the moment but I'm workin on it. He'll be sorry he ever let me talk!

I jes whipped this followin up, yer Grace. Hope you lack it:

You called, Thine Exhaltation,
for help. I answered.
You was in trouble.
I held out my hand.
Its steel there, waiting, to help.
Smy pleasure.

Well that's about all I got fer now. Dont forget to send that check hairmail, and have you looked into offshore banks. I hyar they'll do anythang.

From the deepest darkest dankest dimmist dungeon of worthlessness, I remain, your fateful an obedient servant,

$crounge

VS (7/12/95)

…Ralph mentions Tom Bethel. I was convinced that Bethel was an agent. I told Jim this. But Jim could not see himself that thoroughly infiltrated. I told him that Bill Turner had to be involved in Boxley's efforts to destroy Jim. But Jim loved Turner too much to accept my opinion. Ralph, you have a good bead on Garrison. He was a great but flawed man. My emphasis has to be on his greatness.

Ralph pounces on *Battling Wall Street* without having read it. Maybe you are showing undue haste. I was approached by the Larouche people, Ralph. They were a

strange and rotten bunch. But I would bet after having twice spoken to Don Gibson briefly on the phone that he is of another and much finer breed than the Larouche robots….

VS (8/5/95)

Please allow me as your clerk to comment on this correspondence. As an onlooker who has read most of the literature on the JFK assassination, it seems to me that you have written the very best thinking on the subject. I consider it a great privilege to be able to read your material, which educates me with respect to what happened and why it happened, before, on and after Nov. 22, 1963.

On your differences, they strike me as more apparent than real. Some of you attribute the killing and the cover-up to Vietnam. Others attribute it to intragovernmental, internecine bureaucratic struggle in the national security state apparatus. Others see a civilian power elite controlling the events. Others see a supranational power group as manipulating the events. Others view the American intelligence services as dictating the flow of the history surrounding the death of Kennedy. Others see personal animosities, such as the hatred of Allen Dulles and the people around him, as the cause. Still others see Cuba as the irritant which triggered the events. Others see the Cold War struggle between command and market societies as the mechanism which dictated the assassination. Others see the military industrial complex's insatiable need for profit as the basis. Others view American business' need to dispose of Kennedy as the catalyst.

…In my view, all of your thinking is compatible. But we struggle with one another's thinking, because we tend to adopt voluntarily as a committee of correspondence the same division of labor concept which was forced on the hapless opportunistic lawyers who represented the Warren Commission. Therefore, we sometimes neglect to see the overall picture of the truth in the killing of Kennedy.

Why? Why do we naturally and voluntarily thrust at one aspect of the picture rather than step back and see it all? I, as your anarchistic clerk, have some difficulty doing it because to do so causes me to dismiss any trust in our governmental institutions, in the national security apparatus, in our business elite, in our political democracy, in our constitution, in our national security state, in our left, moderate and right political intellectuals, in our political party structure, in Wall Street, in our intelligence services, in our military, in our legal and medical profession, in the Kennedy family, in our press, in our Congress, in our court system, in capitalism, in the Soviet Union which never blew the whistle on American intelligence's killing of Kennedy, and in the American Presidency and in the American people.

To know the truth in the Kennedy assassination and to speak out on it is to become an outlaw. President Fidel Castro was the only world leader who, having been directly target by the assassination, nonetheless had the courage to tell the truth about it. He continues to be an outlaw. Jim Garrison was our only United States political figure who knew the truth and tried to operate on it. He was treated as an outlaw. This committee, which I serve in ministerial functions, has in common an outlaw status.

But, as a band of outlaws, let us honor one another, for no one outside the committee will honor us for your work. Treat one another with respect. Truth seekers are rare, and we should therefore treasure each of our correspondents. As a band of outlaws, we ought not to deal with the truth as a mechanism with which to render sadistic cuts in

the enemies of truth. Rather, we should understand that what we get from our exchanges permits us to think and feel free.

Those who are not willing to understand and speak out on the truth behind the killing of Kennedy are not outlaws. But in a sense they are worse off than outlaws and therefore deserve our understanding and sympathy. Because to be a player and to count in the discourse over the Kennedy assassination compels you to accept that you are imprisoned in a vast and smothering blanket of lies. By not counting, we become outlaws. But by not counting we are not imprisoned and suffocated by the lies which envelope those who refuse to think about the truth of the Kennedy assassination and its implications for our society. This is our reward, freedom. It is a considerable one….

MM (9/10/95)

[This a letter I wrote to Don Gibson, included here because Vince said he agreed with my conclusions (cf. VS10/18/95).]

Dear Don,

I don't think we differ at all on the nature of the power structure. What you are calling the Establishment I call the Rich Guys, but both terms are a little too broad for what we are talking about. The power elite or ruling class, or simply upper class, would probably be more accurate. Ramsey Clark calls them plutocrats. I have no doubt that they run things, including the military-industrial-intelligence-media complex. The question is how they do it and what we can do about it, if anything.

Please read my letter to Fletch Prouty, which should be in the next packet from Vince. I have the same trouble with your "Establishment" that I have with his "High Cabal."

But I want to get back to Vietnam. I find your attitude perplexing. You say "I cannot prove that money made from defense contracts played no role in the decision to kill JFK." Why the hell would you *want* to prove this? I asked you to name one other policy that the assassination reversed that generated anything comparable to $570 billion over the next ten years. You could not. Can we put this in the record, please? But then you tried to argue, nevertheless, and are still trying to argue, that $570 billion wasn't really that much money anyway, and that to kill a president just for that (not to mention several million other people) would amount to a "street crime" committed for what you say is chicken feed. I believe I answered those arguments in my last letter, and you have not responded. It is obvious that $570 billion is *not* chicken feed, and you cannot name anything else with a comparable price tag that you can tie to the JFK's death, yet you insist on repeating your assumption. We won't get anywhere like this. I think the burden is on you to show how "insignificant" $570 billion is, if that is what you believe.

You say I am "arbitrarily reducing this to the simplest of motives" and that I "dismiss the issues of neo-colonialism, aid and trade policy, government spending (amounts and purposes), money and credit, the role of government in the economy, and even other specific foreign policy issues (Brazil, Dominican Republic, etc.) as irrelevant (or beyond our understanding) in favor of measuring the pile of money made in one ten-year period."

Nothing of the sort. I do not dismiss any of these things. You are dismissing the importance of the war in favor of a complex web of issues which leads–where? To the notion that America is run by a ruling class? That is old news. To the notion that JFK was a proletarian savior who would have brought about a revolution and a complete

restructuring of the US government if he had not been eliminated? This is absurd. Obviously, I don't get it, so perhaps you can make it clear where you are headed.

Why are you so reluctant to accept the "simplest of motives," namely greed, especially when it coincides with all the other things you mention anyway? There is no conflict between greed and neo-colonial interests.

There is something else you are overlooking. How many people give a shit about Brazil, the Dominican Republic, trade policies, neo-colonialism or the Morgan-Rockefeller oil cartel? Now ask yourself how many people still give a shit about Vietnam? The answers to these two questions in themselves should tell you that you have your priorities wrong.

Vietnam is the one issue that could raise the dead–I mean get us out in the streets. Let's assume for a moment that Vietnam was only reason No. 47 for the assassination. Do you think it would matter to the millions of people who suffered from the war, and are still suffering, whether it was No. 1 or No. 47? Vietnam is the one connection that really counts–not Cuba or McCloy-Zorin or Rockefeller or anything else–for the simple reason that people still care about it. In other words, even if you are right (and I think you are wrong), even if the war was only Reason No. 47 for the perpetrators, it was and remains unquestionably Reason No. 1 for the victims.

The Power Elite knows this. It is what Oliver Stone told millions of people in the film. Of course, the propaganda machine handled that all right, but what puzzles me is why you and so many others (even within our group) who should know better are fighting so hard *not* to know it.

Perhaps you will take another deep breath and try to convince me again why $570 billion is not enough money to kill a president and fight a war for. Your argument that the wealthy increased their wealth more from 1973 to 1985 than from 1963 to 1973 is not even relevant. Just because somebody finds other ways to make money afterwards doesn't mean he didn't rob the bank before.

In the meantime I will stick with my simplistic conclusion, which I think is also that of Jim Garrison, Oliver Stone, and a large percentage of the population, that the CIA killed JFK on behalf of the warmongers (i.e., the Establishment, if you prefer). Perhaps the simplicity of this conclusion is unsatisfying to you and others because it seems to be the end of the trail. It explains quite adequately, at least better than any other theory, all the mysteries, and leaves us with the uncomfortable realization that we are stuck here. There is no mystery. We know what happened. Now what?

Welcome to the Group.

VS (9/13/95)

…Aug. 7, Dr. Cyril H. Wecht on behalf of the Coalition on Political Assassinations asks for a donation. I can only give a token contribution. I can't see the value of begging the murderers, the military-intelligence-industrial National Security State of the U.S. governmental structure, for more data about a case which has long since been explicated to anyone who wants to know by the immense data already provided to the public by the US. Government. It appears to this clerk that we have too much rather than too little information. The mountain of data that we have in this matter permits the murderers to aver that the simple and clear items of evidence, e.g. the holes in the JFK shirt and jacket, Commission Exhibit 399, the leftward and backward impact snap of the whole body of JFK after one of the head hits, etc., are of no more value than any of the

other pieces of evidence. To add to that mountain of already existing information buries even deeper and renders even more obscure the true diamonds of evidence which demonstrate beyond doubt the obviousness of a high-level conspiracy and its patent U.S. National Security State authors.

…Morrissey worries about the sharing of some of Don Gibson's views by groups which Morrissey, and most of us, would consider to be pernicious. My sense is that some great truths are deposited in and emerge from the printed journals of basically bad groups so as to inoculate the public against accepting those truths. If the John Birch society is for helping to cure AIDS, I am not going to line up against the allocation of resources towards the cure of this horror.

Aug. 11, 1995, Zola [Ray Marcus] asks me to write. Zola, I, unlike you, can't write and have nothing to tell. And if I could write and had something to relate, my beautiful wife, Betsy, would not allow me to do so. I am terrified of going against the wishes of my extraordinarily good wife. Zola, I, unlike you, have done nothing of significance except to serve as a clerk for you guys, all of whom can write well and have important things to say. Now, Zola, you say that my contributions are more important than yours. Upon finishing reading that preposterous statement, I reflexively reached for the jacket pin which I proudly wore on the left lapel of my suit coat that read "#2". I had that pin made in gold immediately after Fonzi deposed me from the pedestal which I had so proudly mounted as the most modest person in the group. With that reflexive action I ripped that pin off my lapel with such force as to take a swatch of clothing with it, thereby ruining my jacket. I have put in an order to have another pin made, this bearing "#3". Any challengers?

…Aug. 21, a great letter from enchanting $crounge. I am lost in admiration for $crounge. But for Morrissey's threat to terminate you, the ten million dollars probably would already have been sent to you. But I became alarmed about his threat to eradicate you. So naturally, out of concern for your well being, I could not bring myself to ask Betsy to transmit the modest stipend which you had respectfully requested. I concluded from that letter that if Betsy had forwarded the funds, Morrissey, out of envy and hatred for you, would have carried out his threat to kill. There must be some way to get this money to you without putting you in danger of liquidation by Morrissey. We must find a way.

…Aug. 22, Morrissey writes to Don Gibson that only the intelligence agencies of the U.S. government had the ability to pull off and cover the assassination. I agree with the first part of the statement. I also agree that the intelligence agencies undertook immediately to cover up the assassination from the general public, but certainly not from anyone who was paying attention to the evidence that was being shoveled at us by the press and the U.S. government. The American press also jumped in immediately to cover. It was joined in the cover-up by the American bar, the medical profession, academe, and the whole power structure of the society.

…Aug. 23, Morrissey to Zola Marcus with very kind words that he much deserves. Morrissey's placing me in the same category as Zola is an indirect way of making me look ridiculous to this group, since you all know the stature of Zola whose accomplishments dwarf my poorly rendered clerical functions. Morrissey reduces Chomsky to a CIA asset. I will say that I find him completely dishonest on the Kennedy assassination. I am not sure whether this dishonesty stems from his need to maintain his

player status or whether he has a closer attachment to the Establishment than just the need to be able to utilize and accept the acclaim of the Establishment's media. Morrissey wants to get Marcus to spell out how he got involved in the assassination work. Again, I don't know whether there is any substantial interest in the early critics. I can speak for myself when I tell you that I can't see anything of interest in my personal involvement.

…Aug. 27, Gibson to Morrissey over the issue of whether the CIA or the Establishment killed Kennedy. My view is that there is such a power structure as is described by Don. I have read C.W. Mills, some of Quigley, and Domhoff's *Higher Circles*. I agree that they are extremely powerful. But the killing of Kennedy I see as an intelligence killing having to do with many aspects of the Cold War. I view it as largely internal to the national security state. Of course, the national security state had powerful civilian allies who joined immediately to accept and cover for the killers. But the killers I view as the CIA and the other intelligence agencies of the national security state which operated autonomously outside of the constitutional structure as a consequence of the rot that had long set into American "democracy." I agree with Morrissey.

Aug. 31, Brown writes to Gibson. Brown defends Chomsky on the JFK matter. Ralph, I am not convinced by your defense. There is something very rotten in Chomsky's embrace of an obvious CIA agent as Jay Edward Epstein.

…Don, I do feel that RFK was central to the cover-up of the assassination. I also feel that he got suckered into playing with CIA anti-Castro brutes whom he thought were serious about getting rid of President Castro. In fact, they were setting up John Kennedy for a situation where those killers were being instructed on how to kill President Kennedy. Of course, all of this was orchestrated from above, and did not constitute some spin-off or rump group. I also feel that Robert Kennedy cooperated in covering up the assassination in the belief that he could structure a political future for himself by playing the game….

VS (10/18/95)

…Sept. 10, Mike's letter to Don about who killed Kennedy and why. Mike's simplistic conclusions are mine.

…Sept. 26, Don Gibson writes me and explains why he does not feel that the CIA's role was important in the cover-up, but that the execution was "farmed out to a group with no formal or immediate connection to the CIA as an organization." Of course, all intelligence assassinations are overlaid with cover stories. But under the doctrine of respondeat superior, the principal is responsible for the work of its agents performed within the scope of their employment. Therefore, I view the CIA and its interlocking connections with the other U.S. intelligence agencies as the murderers. I see the American taxpayers' money directly paying for the operation, albeit on an off-the-shelf basis. Gaeton's book proves that the CIA was central in the execution and in the cover-up.

Because there had to be a chain of command and control exercised by the highest levels of the agency, an operation of this size had to be known to, and financed, controlled, and directed by the leaders of the highest levels of all aspects of our intelligence community. Just because they employed standard operating techniques of discretely distancing themselves from obvious discovery as the executioners of the president does not in any way mean that they were not the principals. Only American intelligence could have authored and covered up such an assassination. And the center of power in the intelligence community had to be privy to and responsible for the operation.

Sept. 20, 1995, Mike Morrissey writes to Ray Marcus. My friend $crounge gets discussed by that brute Morrissey….

VS (12/1/95)

…Nov. 1, 1995, Ralph writes about his concern over COPA honoring Tink Thompson. Ralph, who always overrates me by light years, wants me to be honored by COPA. Ralph, I do not want to be honored by COPA nor by any other group. It is honor enough to be placed by Thompson with Ray Marcus in designating Tink as an agent. It is far more honor than I deserved to have the privilege of clerking for this illustrious group of correspondents. I say this in all seriousness.

…From *Z* magazine, Nov. 1995, Chomsky talks about himself. The reference to the Nazi generals' plot to kill Hitler he got from me. When he asked whether I could report any conspiracy wherein so many people kept quiet as in the Kennedy killing, I offered Shirer's data from *The Rise and Fall...* wherein Shirer states that slightly under 5,000 persons were executed for the aborted attempt on Hitler's death. No one of the military spilled the beans, and the Gestapo, in one of the most authoritarian countries in history, did not report on the planned assassination. I still have not heard of any paper trail that was laid out for Hitler's assassination. Chomsky requires such a trail as proof of a conspiracy. I feel that such a trail would not constitute evidence of a serious conspiracy, but merely solid evidence of serious dementia.

Don Gibson proposes a debate between Arlen Specter and me. Donald, a peace group in Delaware Valley is trying to arrange such a debate. I offered $1,000 to Specter's choice of a charity as an inducement. He once agreed to debate me. Then he withdrew after the announcements went out to the public. It will never happen. But, of course, I would be willing to debate him. I have never had a public debate on the assassination with anyone. I truly don't think the matter is debatable. The Warren Commission issued patent bullshit, and anyone who is serious about exposing the true nature of the Warren Report, and does not have a vegetable for a head, can demonstrate it. I enclose my Nov. 20 letter to the Peace Action Delaware Valley group agreeing to a Specter debate but acknowledging that it will never happen….

MM (12/28/95)

I have just finished Garrison's *A Heritage of Stone*, a great book. He got it 100% right, in 1970.

Since Garrison makes clear his debt to you, Vince, I must confess that I am coming dangerously close to making a hero of you, too. Please do something to cure me of this temptation.

Question: How many people, in your estimation, shared Garrison's view in 1970? What other documents (articles or books) expressed this view (that the CIA did it for the warmongers, specifically for Vietnam) at that time? I think it's clear that we can end the bibliography in this case in 1970, at the latest.

Fletch: We can go from Garrison 1970 to Prouty 1973 saying the CIA is also "In Control of the United States and the World," but I'll be damned if we can go from that to "the CIA didn't do it" in 1995. Jesus H. Christ. Was the SS innocent because they took orders from Hitler, or from some High Cabal behind him?

I am also still waiting for Fletch's answer to the questions I raised in my Bay of Pigs talk. Do you really think, Fletch, that Richard Bissell was so stupid and incompetent that he actually thought the invasion could succeed as planned? I know of no evidence

whatsoever to support your statement that the OAS was prepared or expected to join the invasion if the Brigade lasted three days or so, and there is no other way they could have survived without US intervention. Bissell's purpose in making all the incredible "blunders" that he made (including having his ex-student McGeorge Bundy call off the air strikes), which as I've tried to describe were not only incredibly stupid and negligent and totally out of character but also systematic, was to make sure the invasion failed as quickly as possible, so that Kennedy could be pressured into sending in the Marines. You think they were all just being stupid, but you know as well as I do that they were not stupid. Then you say the CIA didn't kill Kennedy, either! What's going on here?

Don Gibson: You obviously didn't read my letter to Newman. If you had you might have thought twice about saying the CIA is not guilty "as an institution" just because they have or had a few bad apples. It is clear why ex-intelligence officer Newman would wish to exonerate his former (we hope) employers, but what's your story?

Ok, Prouty (incredibly enough) and Gibson want us to exonerate the CIA, and presumably the SS as well, since that would follow from the same logic. Newman is also scrambling to exonerate the CIA (as an *institution*, of course), and Michael Parenti doesn't find this objectionable. After all, he actually *met* Newman and *liked* him. How does he know Newman's fellow agents are mad at him? Well, no, we don't want to answer such a personal question, do we? Better to jump on Morrissey for daring to criticize Newman, and leave it at that, right? And by all means, do NOT bother to actually read the books concerned or understand the issues that I raised. Just zap me, and hope the others at COPA will follow suit–which they did, except for John Thomas. Where is Parenti's answer to John Thomas? I am not worthy of an answer from you, and neither is John. His time is too valuable to waste on troublemakers like us.

And then along comes Marty Schotz, who tells us we are irrational and schizoid and unwitting agents of the CIA if we even dare to discuss these issues, since they are all trivial compared to the McCloy-Zorin agreements and whatever Fidel Castro does or says–presumably including putting HIV-positives in concentration camps.

And Don Gibson, waving his long bibliography, assuring us that the Rich Guys would never kill a president and fight a war for a mere $570 billion, and that the CIA as an institution is innocent.

Ralph, as far as I can tell, is not convinced that the withdrawal policy was reversed after JFK's murder. Ralph, tell me that I'm wrong, or tell me you disagree with Garrison. In the latter case, read my letter to Newman again. If you have any arguments after that, let's hear them.

I am not going to put up with this shit. This is not a game. Garrison was right. Vince is right. I am right.

I would like to make a request. Since I have only a vague idea who gets these mailings, I would like to suggest that each recipient state clearly whether or not he/she thinks Garrison was right or wrong. I would like to know who I am writing to.

No one is going to defend the CIA or the SS (which follows from the same logic) and get away with it, as long as I'm in this discussion.

According to that curious rag, *The Spotlight*, Michael Collins Piper has a book out saying the Mossad killed JFK, and that one of the backers of the Stone film was an Israeli arms manufacturer. I will read the book when I get hold of it, but this sounds to me like

more disinformation. On the other hand, that rag is the only one I know that says Garrison was right. There is no contradiction, since I'm sure the Mossad and the CIA work hand in hand, but anyone who thinks the Mossad is the superior organization is off his rocker.

Garrison was right, in 1970, and nothing has changed in 25 years, except that we have a lot more Nazi sympathizers, agents, and plain dumb assholes who want desperately to think he was wrong. And people shake their heads and wonder how such a thing could happen in Germany! We are worse than the Germans. They watched the Jews disappearing and wearing yellow stars, and we watch a coup d'état, watch them kill us in Vietnam for the next ten years, watch them release AIDS on us to fight National Security Threat No. 2 (after nuclear war), overpopulation in the Third World, and on and on, till we have what we have, and we are what we are, in 1995.

But the Germans had a real terror regime. They had no Garrisons, Salandrias, and Oliver Stones. Ok, the CIA has improved considerably on the SS by mastering the art of deception, but this is a much weaker excuse than the Germans had. They at least had to be forced. We have let ourselves be seduced. Our own weakness is what has allowed it to continue, and get worse. It's like the difference between being knocked down on the street and date rape. If we have to blame the victims, we are all more guilty than Hitler's Germans.

Look at us. Even in our little group, which is already very, very eccentric and isolated, we are full of shit. I move that we chuck out the shit. Do you agree with Garrison or not? Those of you who don't, who want to defend the CIA, go ahead, but show your goddam colors. Then you will have a fight with me.

Jacob Segal, the Jim Garrison of AIDS, died recently. The newest and last book, which probably will not make it into English either, is *AIDS Ist Besiegbar*, Neuer Weg, Kaninenberghöhe 2, 45136 Essen, 1995. If any of you know an English-language publisher who would take it on, write to Neuer Weg. I would do the translation, but there is no point in that unless there is a publisher, and they usually like to do their own.

I guess that's enough vitriol for today.

1996

VS (1/12/96)

…Dec. 24, 1995, an impassioned letter from Mike which I think requires response.

…Mike asks how many people in 1970 shared Garrison's view. Well, Marty and Chris Kefalos did. Harold Feldman, who was the my brother-in-law did. Several of my friends did. I suspect that more than 100,000 in this country knew, but kept quiet. What was so difficult to figure out? Oswald reeked of U.S. intelligence. The Warren Commission held secret hearings. The evidence of Dealey Plaza screamed out that this was the work of a not-so-covert paramilitary operation. The Warren Commission Report was patent horse shit. Lots of people knew. Anybody who read with a critical eye, even in a cursory fashion, the Warren Report, had to know how high up the conspiracy went. Anyone who observed the reaction of the Kennedy family had to know.

Mike, I am not close, not far, not anything like a hero. Although I was apparently the first to attack the Warren Report in print systematically, I was weak enough to be sorry that someone else wasn't expressing the obvious about it, i.e. that it was a cover-up of a high-level U.S. governmental conspiracy.

As for heroes, Jim Garrison was certainly one. He would have easily risen to be governor of Louisiana and/or a US senator. When we first met, he was only clear that there was a conspiracy of a high level. He did not have his mind centered on the CIA. But Jim's mental capacity dwarfed my own. He learned quickly. He quickly surpassed my understanding.

We met about six times. We spoke on the phone perhaps fifteen times. We corresponded briefly. He owed almost nothing to me. I served some clerical functions in the monumental task that he was undertaking to be the only public figure in the whole world to attack the Kennedy killers on a sustained basis.

He never uttered a cross word to me. He never was anything other than gracious and charming while I sharply criticized his thinking, "friends," understanding of the assassination, writing and conclusions. In return for my captious hammering at him, he credited me first in his *Heritage of Stone*. This allegedly flamboyant self-seeking, egotistical paranoid character rewarded my carping at him in his signed copy that he sent to me in April of 1972 by writing "For Vince Salandria, my old friend and mentor." In his gift to me of *On the Trail of the Assassins*, he wrote: "December, 1988–For my great friend, Vincent Salandria, still the undefeated champion and leading intellectual of all the critics, to whom I remain indebted for his encouragement and help." See attached copies.

Needless to say, you well know that I am none of the things which Jim said I was. And needless to say, he was much, much more of a person than I and a far, far better person than the lackey American press made him out to be. But for my small contributions he was willing to credit me with being his mentor.

Mike, if you are looking for a hero in this case, look no further than Jim Garrison. Knowing him was one of the best aspects of my full, satisfying and long life.

MM (3/26/96)

I know you are a reluctant hero, Vince, but I submit that you, being one of the first denizens of what I call Ground Zero, and the very first person in the universe to systematically attack the Warren Report in print, are indeed, without question and with emphasis, a hero.

Not only for that, though. This correspondence is your child, yours alone. How many of us would do it, even if we too were multimillionaires, or maybe I should say especially if we were? How many of us would so kindly and indulgently respond, with never a harsh word for anyone, except in jest, and sign our letters "love," and mean it?

Why is our correspondence–over a foot high sitting on my desk now, and growing more or less bi-monthly–so important? It is the first literature of Ground Zero. This is the new age, I suspect the first significant change of consciousness in post-mortem America (which began on 11/22/63). You and the 100,000 others you say also knew were the first to occupy this landscape, and you were the first to explore it. It's quite fitting, then, that you are now the father–mother if you prefer–but in any case the creator and sustainer of the first coherent body of literature dealing with what you call the Macroanalysis.

I prefer "Ground Zero" because for me the word "analysis" sounds too scientific–not that I think we are unscientific but for me, science, and scholarship of any kind, are not enough to deal with the situation we are in.

Ralph, I have never contended that the war was the *only* reason for the assassination. I say it was the most important one, certainly for the victims, and probably also for the perpetrators. I've been through this with Don Gibson, who agrees with you on this, whatever else you have been squabbling about. I challenged Don to adduce a single other policy that was reversed after the assassination that had a comparable price tag on it: $570 billion, in 1991 dollars, the so-called "cost" of the war. He answered in a way I found unconvincing, and I tried to explain why I found it so. Did you miss this exchange? If you agree with Don on this, I wish you would tell me which of the arguments he offered that you find convincing.

If you can't do this, I don't think you (or Marty) are justified in reducing the war to one of several reasons for the assassination. Balking at a war that cost (and could have been predicted then to cost on the order of) $570 billion and millions of lives is simply not comparable to the test ban treaty, the rapprochement with Cuba, the McCloy-Zorin agreements, or whatever other "relatively progressive" policies you want to attribute to JFK.

To use a somewhat exaggerated analogy, this strikes me the same way as if I were to say that the robbers killed the guard because he was preventing access to the bank, and you said, "Oh no, that was only one of the reasons. The guard also refused to let them park in front of the building, objected to their wearing masks, failed to open the door for them, and so on." All of that was no doubt part of it, but the main thing was the money–in the bank and in the war.

Frankly, Ralph, this seems so obvious to me that I fail to understand why you, Don, and Marty insist that it cannot be true. The importance of the test ban and McCloy-Zorin and Cuba etc. is not self-evident. The importance of $570 billion and several million lives is. You are saying all of these things are equal in importance, as far as the assassination is concerned, and I say this defies common sense.

The war was the main motive not only for the JFK assassination but for the others, too. This, again, seems obvious, considering that both King and RFK were killed shortly after (finally) coming out against the war. Do you also have a long list of possible reasons for those murders? What is so hard to grasp? Three politicians got in the way of the war machine and it ate them, just as it ate 58,000 other Americans and millions of southeast Asians. You can tack as many other reasons onto this as you want to, but this was the main one, and I believe it is important to see this clearly and to say so.

I think Garrison said it clearly in *A Heritage of Stone*, and Vince may have said it very early, too, or earlier–I'd have to dig out his articles to make sure, or maybe he can tell us himself. Oliver Stone also said it clearly in *JFK*, despite the obvious, massive press campaign to disguise it. I've made this point before, too. How many reviews of the film did you see that read "Movie Says Warmongers Killed JFK" or the like? If Vietnam was mentioned at all it was buried somewhere in the middle of the article.

The result of the propaganda is that very few people who have seen the film can tell you what the main point of it was–that JFK got in the way of the Vietnam War. I have faulted Stone for this, in part, because of course he could have hit people over the head a lot harder. But maybe Time Warner wouldn't have done the film in that case; maybe they

would not have felt so confident that they could handle the resulting firestorm if he had. Or maybe Stone thought he said it as clearly as he could, and didn't think such a clear, and what should have been shocking, truth required special effects. I'd like to ask him these questions, but I suspect his answer would be the latter–which is ok by me.

I haven't talked to a lot of vets about the film. When I tried to, on VWAR-L, a moderated newsgroup, the first thing I was told was that no one was allowed to discuss that film or any other "conspiracy theories." I tend to think they would and did react differently to the film than others, but in the end I suppose the same miasma has befallen them that has befallen everyone else: the "meaning" and significance of the film has become what the media have said it is. And this meaning, obviously, does not involve answering the question that must be answered before we can talk reasonably about a possible connection between the war and the assassination.

This question is the one I asked you, and Chomsky: Did LBJ reverse the withdrawal policy? If you say "No," as Chomsky does, you can forget about a connection with the assassination because there is nothing to connect. If you are unsure, or find some way not to say "Yes," you can still avoid the further question, because it is hypothetical, and none of us are too interested in hypothetical questions: "Well, IF Johnson reversed the policy, COULD THERE HAVE BEEN a connection with the assassination?" Compare that with: "Johnson reversed the policy; WAS there a connection?"

In the latter case, because it is a real and not a hypothetical question, you can actually get to the further question of connection with the assassination. Then you can talk about the things I tried to talk about with Chomsky and Newman. Once you grant the FACT that the policy was reversed, you must also grant the FACT that the reversal took place immediately after the assassination (proved by Chomsky's own documentation). At that point, you have either a hell of a coincidence, or a very strong causal explanation for the murder of the president, his brother, and Martin Luther King.

Instead of this, we have what I call the false debate between Chomsky et al. and Newman et al., about what JFK was *secretly* thinking before he died and about what he WOULD HAVE DONE IF he had not died. This can go on forever, and is such an obvious distraction from the real questions that I suspect the debate is not sincere. The fact that Chomsky answered me in such an asinine–as he would say, "hysterical"–way, and the fact that Newman could not bring himself to answer at all, is further evidence of their insincerity.

Your remark about "hagiography," I'm afraid, also reminds me of Chomsky. Perhaps you are confusing me with Don Gibson. I have never uttered a word about JFK that could be construed as hagiographical. I have never even referred to him, I don't think, as "relatively progressive," as you have. As I keep reminding people, Reagan's withdrawal from Lebanon and Bush's early withdrawal from the Gulf War are never construed as dovish or saintly. Why should the decision of JFK to withdraw from Vietnam by the end of 1965, on the basis of the McNamara-Taylor report claiming satisfactory progress, be understood any differently?

Of course JFK believed in counterinsurgency. Of course he believed in it in Vietnam and sent 16,000 "advisory" troops there. Of course he was not a dove. Of course he was not a saint. But none of this–I repeat, none of this–contradicts the fact that he did not want to send draftees there, as he told Kenneth O'Donnell, and that he had decided to withdraw the "volunteers" as well. This decision does not make him a dove or a saint. It

means he made a sane decision that was contrary to what the warmongers wanted. That's all.

The documentary record shows (for everyone but Chomsky et al.) that the withdrawal decision was based on the assumption (not *condition*, as Chomsky insists on saying) of continuing military success. If you like Newman's speculations, you can imagine that JFK was playing a game, only pretending to think we were winning so he would have an excuse to pull out, because he secretly knew we were losing. But you do not have to agree or disagree with Newman in order to establish the simple (one would think) fact that FOR EITHER ONE REASON OR THE OTHER (i.e., forget the false debate), JFK had decided to withdraw.

That is the point that must be settled before we can talk about "Vietnam as a consequence of the assassination." I'm sorry if I seem over-zealous in pursuing it, but having been through the wringer with Chomsky, who simply refused to concede the point, I cannot accept anything but a yes or no answer to my question.

Fletch, you say again that it is Lansdale in the tramps photo, with his back to the camera. I don't think I could recognize my own wife with certainty from behind, even in real life. Just what is it that you recognize about Lansdale in this black-and-white photo? The ears? The hair? The clothes? The posture?

Of the books you discuss, I would certainly like to read *Trance Formation of America*. (Why do I think of Noam Chomsky?) Where in the world do you come across these books? I mean, a 14th century work (*The Muqaddimah*) by Ibn Khaldun is not exactly the kind of thing that would be reviewed in the *Washington Post*.

Now, I'm going to light into you a little, but don't get me wrong. I am still your friend and will remain so. I think you are being inconsistent, but I don't think you are being dishonest. If I thought that, I wouldn't go to all this trouble. It's a lot of work.

I also have some questions. You say *Trance Formation* is 'really hot' and that certain publications have already started to set "backfires." What do you mean?

You have a way, Fletch, of telling anecdotes that is fascinating, but frustrating because you don't name names. Who was the "old CIA insider" that ducked behind his desk when you came into the HSCA area?

I think you are right to dissociate yourself from Liberty Lobby. You don't need Tom Valentine or *The Spotlight* as a forum. I subscribe to *Spotlight* because I read stuff there that I don't read in *The Nation*, *Covert Action Quarterly*, or the *International Herald Tribune*, like the Bilderberger business, and they are the only one of these rags that says the CIA killed JFK, which is pretty credible–and gutsy–in my book. The fact that they also spew out a lot of nonsense certainly doesn't help their credibility, but it doesn't mean they're wrong about everything, either. Still, I wouldn't want them to publish me, because I would not like to be in your position of having to deny all the accusations of "association." I read something recently that turned me way off. I thought I had read somewhere that they were opposed to the Vietnam War, but then I saw this reference to antiwar vets "raising their ugly heads." Talk about ugly.

Re the Bay of Pigs, we're not getting anywhere. You say Bundy "pulled a boner" but a few lines later that he "sabotaged" the plan. That's a contradiction, if I understand the word *sabotage* correctly.

You've got the Cabell/Bissell visit with Thomas Rusk after the Bundy call confused. Both men were there. Bissell, too, would have had time to make the phone call to get the Brigade planes off the ground.

You say the plan was militarily sound. But I think you are forgetting that Bissell & Co.'s lies about the "probability" of an uprising were just that. Those 1500 men on the beach would remain 1500 men on the beach, against an entire army. Even without an air force, Castro's army would have overrun them very quickly. In other words, their ONLY hope was massive US intervention. You still haven't cited your evidence for saying the OAS was poised to intervene, and they would certainly not have intervened when they saw that it was nothing like a counterrevolution but just 1500 men on a beach. So what was militarily sound about the plan, even assuming all of Castro's planes were knocked out?

You point out that John Newman was/is with NSA, not CIA. For me they are all the same. I see no point in trying to keep one secret agency separate from another. It is impossible. When I say CIA, I mean the "intelligence community." Whether it actually works the way it's set up to work, namely with the DCI at the top, is another unanswerable question. As far as I'm concerned, they are the enemy, because 1) they are powerful, 2) they are secret, and 3) (although I don't really think a third reason is necessary) we have ample evidence of their misdeeds.

It is not at all clear now where you are trying to place the blame for "make-war tactics." I have always understood that you place it with the CIA, but now you seem to have a fuzzier position. Your analogy of the CIA, or CIA assets, and the hangman in the JFK case backfires on you, because that would have been the hangman hanging his boss. In that case we certainly would be interested in the hangman! It is only when the hangman is hanging somebody else and we know who his boss is that the hangman is relatively uninteresting.

I'm sorry you didn't respond to my analogy–of the CIA and the SS. Would you say the CIA didn't kill JFK any more than the SS killed the Jews, because both organizations were acting under orders?

But you go further than this. You say: "The biggest role the CIA may have been assigned is that of the creator and manager, even today, of the ever-blooming Cover Story." So now they are not even the hangmen, much less the SS!

You seem to agree that the CIA is more powerful than the Mossad but you point at "London" as the source of the real power. What in the hell are you talking about? This sounds like LaRouche, although I don't know what he's talking about, either. You'd better be careful or you'll end up being "associated" with both Liberty Lobby and LaRouche.

I would ever so humbly opine that given one relatively tangible enemy, an institution of our so-called democratic government that is paid for with our (your) taxes, it is foolish to speculate about some vague greater power behind this enemy, whatever you want to call it–the High Cabal, the System, the Power Elite, the military-industrial complex, the London international Banking Plot, etc. The CIA–by which I mean the "intelligence community"–is enemy enough.

Fletch, you have contributed an enormous amount to the public discussion, and you have been very generous with your time with me and given me many ideas and stimuli that I don't think would have come my way otherwise. You have earned the right to a few inconsistencies. I have to articulate them to keep things straight in my own mind,

but I am not trying to nail you to the wall. We will remain friends as long as we are honest with each other. I stopped writing to Chomsky not because I disagreed with him, but because I felt that he was being dishonest. He avoided my questions and tried to make me feel stupid while doing so. It didn't work.

Speaking of the Bay of Pigs, I recently read in a book about Wallace Stevens by Peter Brazean (*Parts of a World*) that there was a Richard Bissell, president of the Hartford Fire Insurance Co. and Stevens' boss. The Evan Thomas article that John Thomas sent along says the CIA Bissell was also from Hartford, so there is a surprising possible connection–father and son, perhaps?

John, you talk about "rationing our anger," and of course you are right. I am concerned about your health, and I appreciate your concern about mine. On the other hand, perhaps a measured release of anger can relieve stress instead of creating it. I did a bad job of it in my last letter, for which I apologize–but if it brought you back to the keyboard perhaps it wasn't all that bad.

I want to try to explain why I have focused my anger on the CIA–"CIA," as I've said, as a cover term for the entire "intelligence community" or "national security state" or (as Bill Moyers called it) the "secret government." I have compared "them" with the SS because they constitute an institutional conspiracy within our supposedly democratic government, with a history of ruthlessness and total disregard for democratic principles. If the CIA did not kill JFK, if they did not reverse their assessment of the war two days after the assassination, if they did not kill MLK and RFK, they should have told us who did a long time ago. If they can't do that, what good are they?

I can't accept your analogy with the LAPD. They are not a secret organization with unlimited funds, unlimited power, and no effective external controls. If they were, there would be no question–of course they should be eliminated. "But then," you say, "politics would demand some new super-secret entity to monitor nuclear terrorism and keep track of those dangerous damn commie peasant priests and nuns in Latin America. The pea would be moved to another shell."

True enough, but it would be up to us to keep that from happening. That's why I would go after them on principle, rather than just purging and punishing individuals, which as you say just means that six months later everything will be back as it was, or even worse, since we'll all have relaxed and think things are ok. That's exactly what happened after the "purges" of the 70's, after which, I read somewhere, employment applications at the CIA increased substantially.

The principle I would attack is secrecy–what Daniel Brandt referred to in the Internet posting that Ralph sent along as "cryptocracy," i.e. secret government. We should abolish it. Tear it down and chuck it out, and keep it out.

How many secrets have to be kept? Where the missiles are, the security codes, stuff like that, granted. But these are all things that could be openly and clearly and specifically justified, one by one. Why is there no discussion of this? Because secrecy is the antithesis of democracy and the worm that has destroyed our government. It is Richard Helms and people like him sitting on our faces.

You are right to say debate is a reflection of friendship and trust, and we cannot have debate with secrecy. It destroys everything, and to the extent that they convince us that we need it, for our "own good," we destroy ourselves. Secrecy is the enemy of

freedom, trust, communication, understanding, curiosity, and love. In accepting it, we diminish our humanity. In fighting it, we are fighting for our humanity.

In a sense, even the most abject medieval peasant was freer and more enlightened than we are, because at least he knew who he was, and who the princes were, and how they related to each other. Can we say as much? I don't think so. We are essentially trying to figure out who is calling the shots, who is running the world, and we all have our own ideas about it. This is not the kind of curiosity I referred to above, which is the curiosity of science and art, man reflecting on and trying to come to terms with his existential condition. What we are left with is a much less noble curiosity–about other people and their secret machinations, their intrigues–and it is short-lived because we just get tired of it. We get tired of the shell game, as you put it. It is quintessentially boring to try to follow all the different ways the thugs and con men are screwing us, and it's their game. We can't win. We have to refuse to play.

That is the great contribution that our group can make. We can show others, first by showing ourselves, how it is possible to live and fight for our humanity at what I call Ground Zero, you call the other side of the looking glass (that is, reality), and Vince calls the level of the Macroanalysis. It's not easy. We can't just walk away from it as we would a shell game on the street. We are fully caught up in it, and are part of it, because this web of lies and manipulation is what our world has become. It is no longer a simple and transparent matter of the princes telling the peasants what to do. They have got us thinking we are little princes too, and to some extent I guess we are. The important thing is that we see our predicament as clearly as possible and fight against it. We do that every time we write to each other. It is not "mental masturbation"–or if it is, so what? We can't all fuck the princess, but if we can imagine doing so, what's wrong with that?"

Some recent news items:

Margot Williams says "electronic communications can live forever. Even clicks on Web pages can be logged and analyzed":

Although the volume of postings limits live access on local servers, the full feeds have long been put into archives in various places–perhaps as far back as 1979, when Usenet started. As a result, any words anyone has posted might be available somewhere for retrieval and have probably been used by direct marketers and other researchers for some time. This applies only to Usenet and those electronic-mail discussion groups that are posted to Usenet; private electronic mail and messages are not available via Usenet, although they might be archived in other locations ("Internet Keeps Tabs On Cyberspace Visitors," IHT 3/18/96:11).

That's an encouraging prospect! Suppose snail mail disappears altogether, along with stage coaches and the pony express? It is foreseeable. Imagine Big Brother having instant access to every word you have ever written, and to increasingly sophisticated software for analyzing this corpus–your virtual self. It would also be manipulable, since it would be their archive, not yours.

Who killed Rabin?

In closing arguments that wrapped up the two-month trial, Yigal Amir's lawyer said contradictions in the evidence had led him to believe his client shot blanks at Mr. Rabin without knowing it, while someone else killed him ("Rabin Trial Closes On a New Theory," IHT 3/18/96:5).

The Brits are wondering now if their gun laws are strict enough ("U.K. Takes Anguished Look at Its Gun Laws," IHT 3/18/96:5), but the US gun lobby will use the murder of the Scottish schoolchildren to show that even strict gun laws couldn't prevent it. They won't mention the other murders that the laws do prevent.

In a review of *Spymaster: The Real-Life Karla, His Moles, and the East German Secret Police* by Leslie Colitt (IHT 3/18/96:4), Marc Fisher says:

The overwhelming mass of what Wolf and the Stasi collected was meaningless nonsense, and the overwhelming majority of those who did the collecting were, as Colitt says, "slavishly obedient and disoriented" citizens who, like their leaders, "had been morally crippled beyond recognition, first by Nazism and then by Stalinism.

Fischer seems ready to believe that Marcus Wolf, the former head of the East German secret police, a German Jew who trained Palestinian terrorists, knows nothing. He describes the mentality of the East German mole somewhat differently than Colitt in the quotation above: "Many East German moles worked for Wolf without pay, either in gratitude for the education their country had given them or out of some sense of obligation to communism"? He describes Wolf himself as "a remarkable figure, a rousing success," an "outsider" and an "intellectual in a petrified bureaucracy," whose personal warmth and concern for his agents elicited unshakable loyalty"? A good guy, in other words, trapped in an evil society.

Who can swallow this–the simultaneous trivialization and glorification of a state security apparatus that, before its demise, Fischer and everyone else would have vehemently described as an evil second only to that of the Gestapo and the SS?

VS (3/27/96)

Feb. 29, Joe Stimmins writes and asks about Igor Vaganov. I enclose an excerpt from an early article written by Tom Katen, Aaron Schoerner and me. We discuss Vaganov briefly in the article. Since Josiah Thompson was most interested in Vaganov, I lost interest in him. In my judgment, he may have had some backup role in the assassination which never got played out. He seems to have been a right-winger. Therefore, if he had a role, then it was to point to the right wing as a possible candidate for having planned the assassination. Certainly, the U.S. intelligence services have many such persons stashed away in our society ready to be used for future intelligence ventures. He may have just been sent to Dallas to be used as a red herring to be discovered and chased after by the likes of me.

…Ralph asks why the official apologists always include Oswald in the conspiracy. If the U.S. Government chose Oswald as the fall guy, and chose him before any other agency fingered Oswald, and Oswald was innocent, then the center of the U.S. governmental power, institutionally speaking, had to have been the only logical candidate for the genesis of the conspiracy. If he were a guilty member of the group, then the U.S. government, in fingering him, and seizing upon him as an assassin, was on the path of truth, but was merely guilty of having overlooked his accomplices. Given the time pressures, the cleverness of the conspirators, the political need for arriving at an explanation that would not cause disunity in the nation, the U.S. government, the Warren Commission and its staff, the media, all innocently combined to protect the society against the irresponsibility of nuts such as us.

VS (4/2/96)

I am pleased to forward the March 26, 1996 contribution of Professor Michael Morrissey. Of course, ignore the business about your clerk. Ignore nothing else. Clearly, Morrissey is a person of passion, integrity, courage, candor and brilliance. Can we ask more of a person?

With respect to his grasp of the significance of the JFK assassination, I am one of his admirers. To the extent that I can ever be a follower, I plead guilty to being one of his followers.

VS (5/16/96)

…April 30, Ray sends us Lionel Trilling's introduction to Orwell's *Homage to Catalonia*. Orwell is the writer who has most influenced my political thinking.

MM (9/21/96)

I read recently that Allen Ginsberg predicted JFK's assassination. He wrote in his journal, on Oct. 31, 1959):

Dream

...sat & read Look mag at Dr's office, 14 St. accompanying my brother to his checkup–all about 1960 presidential races, Kennedy's politicianings & shiftiness–He has a hole in his back. Thru which Death will enter (*Journals: Early Fifties Early Sixties*, ed. Gordon Ball, Grove Press, p. 111).

I enclose a translation and commentary on a review of Posner's *Case Closed* by Rudolf Augstein, the long-time, supposedly left-leaning editor of *Der Spiegel*, a highly respected weekly, often accused of being anti-American. Augstein now believes there was no conspiracy in the Kennedy assassination. I don't wonder about people like Posner, who is an obvious agent, but when people like Augstein–who is *not* an American, put their reputation and integrity on the line and endorse this garbage, then I do wonder. Why are they lying? It can't be blind patriotism, since Augstein isn't even an American.

Ray Marcus says Chomsky is one of those who "regardless of the facts of the case (and in most instances, believing there was a conspiracy), nevertheless decided that to pursue it would be a useless diversion from the struggle against the ruling class, capitalism, etc..."–a position which Ray denounces as "false, irresponsible, and shameful."

Ditto for I. F. Stone, although Stone's purpose, says Ray, "was to close ranks with the Establishment–fearing serious consequences, if the evidence pointed to conspiracy, for what he saw as the peace and stability of society."

But this doesn't make them agents, Ray says.

I cannot believe that Chomsky would sacrifice his integrity for some vague Marxist agenda. Nor that I. F. Stone would sacrifice his for fear of the public's inability to handle the truth. The motive for lying, in the case of such men, who are anything but naive or stupid, has to be of a higher order. It must lie at the very heart of the matter. The force that is able to corrupt them must be at least as powerful as that behind the guns of Dallas and Vietnam.

The time has come, I keep telling myself, to say goodbye to the likes of Chomsky and Mailer and Rudolf Augstein, to pluck them from my consciousness forever, along with Howard Hunt, Richard Helms, Marcus Wolf, George Bush, and the rest of them. I am only making these scum seem more important by thinking about them so much. They're never going to confess. They're never going to say uncle. Have I not proved that with Chomsky? I keep butting my head against these stone walls. Do I enjoy it, or what?

VS (9/27/96)

We apparently have had our say on the assassination for at least a while. How else do we explain the hiatus? I feel that a reduction in the volume of correspondence is healthy insofar as it demonstrates that some of us at least are not white heat fanatics and know when to say enough already.

There will be future interest in the JFK assassination. The criminal actions of the U.S. Government in killing Kennedy and then covering it up with the help of our media have cut deep and running wounds in our society which will not easily heal and cannot be forgotten.

Marty's book is at the printer. You will all be receiving copies within weeks. I think that it is special, so special that it will be thoroughly and almost completely ignored in this country except for some few extraordinary readers such as the members of this group. But Marty is prepared for the extremely limited interest which the book will elicit. He feels that he owes its publication to the minute aspects of our citizenry and those of other nations who might want to explore the nature of the assassination and why the American public did not see fit to come to know the truth and to act on it.

…You will find attached to this mailing a number of newspaper articles. Most of them deal with the TWA 800 crash. The articles are from the *New York Times*, *Newsday*, *Philadelphia Inquirer*, and the *Boston Globe*. I intend them as a Rorschach test for the group members. After you see them, what do you *believe* happened? Do you *know* anything is happening or happened? Do you *believe* or *know* that the news is being managed? Do you *believe* or *know* that the evidence is not being weighed in an objective and disinterested fashion? I would very much like to hear from you on this matter. I would very much like to hear from Prof. Chomsky, who can be truly great on media analysis but for the JFK assassination media coverage….

MM (11/16/96)

Dialogue at my sanity hearing (fiction):

"So, Mr. Morrissey," says the judge, "you agree with everything else Professor Chomsky says, everything he has written?"

"Well, not everything," I say, "because I haven't read everything, but virtually everything."

"Except this one thing."

"Yes, your honor."

"And because of this one thing," the judge continues, "despite all the other things you agree about, you believe he is lying–about this one thing–and that therefore he is an agent of the CIA, or Big Brother, as you call it."

"That is correct, your honor."

"Even though you yourself say you were completely oblivious to what you now say is the truth about the assassination until December 1988."

"Yes, sir."

"You even admit that you cannot be sure that you would have had this change of heart and mind earlier, even if you had seen the Turner film or been otherwise informed about the case? In other words, you admit that there are psychological or other, perhaps even inexplicable, metaphysical, factors that can prevent a person from seeing the truth, that is, the truth as you now see it?

"Yes, your honor."

"Then why can't you allow for the possibility that another human being, like Chomsky, can be subject to these same factors, and that he can be honest as you are about what he feels is the truth, even if it is different from your view?

"Well, your honor, it's not that I don't allow for the possibility. I do, in most cases. I just don't think it's likely in Chomsky's case. He's different from me, now, and also from the way I was before December 1988. He is informed, sir. I was not. He is a renowned scholar, and when he says he has reviewed the assassination literature, as he said to me, I believe him. I know from friends like Ray Marcus and Vince Salandria that he has been informed for a long time, at least since the late 60s. He knows about the evidence for conspiracy, for high-level conspiracy, for a coup d'état, and for the connection between the assassination and the war. He knows about it and denies it, or denies its significance. I did not know about it until December 1988. He has lived with this knowledge, without making any public comment on it, as far as I know, until the Stone film came out in 1991. That's almost thirty years. Thirty years that he packed this knowledge away in cold storage in his brain. Mature years, too, not from 20 to 50–I was 42 when I finally woke up–but 40 to his present age, 68. He has been a radical all this time, writing books attacking the US government as capitalist imperialists and warmongers. This is a man who has thoroughly demonstrated his political sophistication and mistrust of government, and of the US government in particular.

"This was not true of myself, sir," I continue, "before December 1988. I always thought that somewhere down the line, we were all Americans, and that the government was on our side. Chomsky never had that faith, or never seemed to, until I heard him say in a film that this is the freest country in the world, a judgment that goes far beyond what I would say myself, now. But until December 1988, the closest I ever got to being a radical was during the Vietnam War. I was against it, against Nixon and Kissinger and the rest of the despicable lot, but it never occurred to me that they were the *enemy*. Actually, I think it would have dawned on me, if I had been confronted, or allowed myself to be confronted, with the information about the assassination, but since that is not what happened, I can't be sure.

"The point is, I was not Chomsky. I was not a radical. He was. I want to be fair, but I simply cannot imagine that he is as blind now, or ever has been as blind, as I was then. He even writes about 'manufacturing consent,' about how journalists and other scholars (excluding himself, of course) allow themselves to become propagandized, how they are forced, by indirect pressure, to except the 'terms of the debate,' as he puts it. There is just no way that I can explain his blindness by assuming that he is living in the same kind of dream world that I lived in until 1988. It's not that I don't *want* to accept this explanation. I can't accept it. It doesn't wash. So, my choice being that he is either his own best example of a propagandized intellectual, or a liar, I have to believe the latter."

"All right," says the judge, "assuming for a moment that you are right, that he is lying on this one issue, why does that make him a CIA agent, in your mind?"

"I know there are those, like Ray Marcus, who agree that Chomsky is lying, but attempt to rationalize it in some way that stops short of calling him an agent. I don't find this speculation of any interest at all. This whole thing is about lying. The government lies, journalists lie, politicians lie (as everyone knows), scholars lie, scientists lie. We have to live with that, but basically that is what we are up against. Now we have to live with people like Chomsky lying, too? No. I don't care what his motives are for lying. No

matter who or what he thinks he is serving, by lying he betrays us all, and serves our enemy, because lying *is* the enemy. It doesn't matter whether he is on anybody's payroll. The damage is the same–even worse, in fact, if he is not. No one is bothered much to know that Richard Helms is a liar. But Alexander Cockburn? Norman Mailer? I. F. Stone? Rudolf Augstein? Noam Chomsky? That hurts. That's a killer. It sits deep, and doesn't go away. If these guys are not agents, they are worse than agents, as my friend Vince once said.

"Think, your honor, of those unfortunate citizens of the ex-GDR who woke up one morning to find their wives or husbands had been spying on them for the Stasi all these years. That's the level of betrayal I'm talking about, or almost. I mean, I don't have conjugal feelings towards Noam Chomsky or Alexander Cockburn, but feelings of intellectual solidarity are feelings, too, and they are important to some of us. They are important to me. What difference does it make why they lied? If they did, they betrayed us, pure and simple."

"I'm sure," says the judge, "that Professor Chomsky would be grieved to hear you say that, Mr. Morrissey. I'm sure he would not like being the cause of such profound disillusionment."

"I'm not sure of that at all," I say. "In any case, I've invested too much emotional and intellectual energy in him already. Look at this conversation we're having. Don't you think I know that I'm going round and round, repeating myself ad nauseam? I've got to get beyond this guy. He's important, but not all-important. He demonstrates how deeply the Big Lie has penetrated our culture, in particular our intellectual culture–what I used to think was the best we had. If that is gone, what's left? If they are lying, who is left to tell the truth? If the 'wild men in the wings' are nothing more than stage hands, where does that leave us? In a sea of faces, where we always were, watching an opera buffa. And I'm beginning to lose interest. It's not funny. Does that mean I'm insane, your honor?"

"Fortunately for you, Mr. Morrissey," the judge replies solemnly, "this is not a real sanity hearing. I just am a figment of your imagination."

"You mean I can tell you to go fuck yourself, and Noam Chomsky, too?"

"Well, as long as you do it in a fictional way, I suppose so."

_____

I now have *Emerging Viruses*, by Leonard Horowitz, and two books by Alan Cantwell, *AIDS and the Doctors of Death* and *Queer Blood*. They support the theory of artificial origin with genocidal intent, thus going beyond Segal and corroborating my worst suspicions.

Have you heard of another new book by Edward T. Haslam called *Mary, Ferrie & the Monkey Virus*. Is there be a link between the AIDS plot and the assassination?

Horowitz tells the story of Robert Strecker's brother Ted, an attorney, who was probably murdered after working to publicize his brother's theories linking the DOD to AIDS. Ted was also apparently the person who first called attention to the damning 1969 MacArthur testimony (although it was in the Congressional Record). He was found dead in Springfield, Missouri, on Aug. 11, 1988, with his 22-caliber rifle lying next to him–an apparent suicide, though Robert had talked with him the night before and found him in good spirits, and there was no suicide note.

A few weeks later, on Sept. 22, Illinois State Representative Douglas Huff, who was also very active in disseminating Dr. Strecker's theory, which is very close to Segal's,

was also found dead, supposedly of a drug overdose, though he was only an occasional "recreational" user, according to The Strecker Group (whatever that is).

These murders should not be taken lightly. They are reminders that anyone can come between the cross-hairs, anytime. I saw a film on TV the other night called *Twilight's Last Gleaming* (1976), starring Burt Lancaster, Paul Winfield, Richard Widmark, and Paul Durning, directed by Robert Aldrich. Lancaster is an ex-general who threatens to unleash nuclear missiles unless the president makes public a certain document which will tell the American people "the real reason why we are in Vietnam." The document is "NSC Report 9795" in the film, but could just as well have been NSAM 263. At end of the film, the president is shot by military sharpshooters along with Lancaster and Winfield, thus demonstrating that it is more important to the powers-that-be to keep the document secret than to save the president's life. The most poignant moment of the film is when Lancaster realizes that this is the inevitable outcome of his idealistic undertaking. "What do I do now?" Lancaster says. What, indeed.

Marty, your book arrived three days ago, for which I thank you very much. It is a great contribution. Of course I have read most of it before, but having it in book form makes a big difference. Now the truth is more than just a stack of correspondence on my desk. It has an ISBN number and, hopefully, before too long, a call number in our library, so I can refer people to it.

Being taken from the most important dialogue taking place in the world today, namely our correspondence, it is automatically an important book. As far as I know, it is the first one ever to go beyond the *question* of conspiracy and deal with it as a fact, and in a way that is reasonable, without letting that fact, upsetting though it is, lead to denial (à la Chomsky et al.) or to the opposite extreme, to equally irrational imaginings of the enemy's identity and structure (e.g., extra-terrestrials).

It is thus the first book of the new age, the new era of consciousness, the new reality that I call Ground Zero, which is emerging from the correspondence.

I admire your innovative spirit in putting it together as you did, with 90% appendices. You have been very honest in balancing what you have to say with what others have said that has influenced your opinion, and demonstrate this honesty by printing the original contributions by Vince, Ray, and the others, which I dare say most ego-bound writers would dispense with, since they are, technically speaking, available elsewhere–though not easily, which is the point.

Thanks for mentioning my name, and even my "book," a couple of times. I'm not sure what I'll do if anyone actually writes for a copy, since I don't have any more, but maybe I'll reprint it, which would give me a chance to correct the errors.

My reaction in a nutshell: Bravo! The book is an inspiration. It encourages me, at least, a great deal. The truth is depressing, but talking about it, and then getting it, or at least a great deal of it, between hard covers to use as the basis for further talk is the best antidote to depression. Talk, save us, James Joyce said somewhere.

I agree, as you know, that the closest we can come to the face of the enemy is the CIA–meaning, as you say, the "intelligence community," which includes many agencies and individuals, inside and outside of government. The most logical place to suspect the center, at least the operational center, of the enemy is at places like Langley, because that is the way the government is set up! This should be obvious to those who willing to see it, but denial is rampant here, too. Why look for a High Cabal or some equally ill-defined

secret power structure, when we already have a quite well-defined secret power structure, with a long history of outrageous crimes, in our "intelligence" agencies?

This is the best example, it occurs to me, of denial analogous to your case of the parents who find their teenaged son's behavior "intolerable," but tolerate it anyway. Everyone blabbers about the intolerability (not to mention unconstitutionality and immorality) of secrecy in democratic government, but at the same time everybody in fact tolerates it. The very existence of the CIA is continuing and blatant testimony that Americans–and people in other countries–are in a deep pathological state of denial and Crimestop. We may have to amend the psychiatric textbooks with a little Orwell.

I suppose there is a ton of technical psychiatric literature on denial, and that you could get more deeply into it, differentiating among different types and degrees, and comparing what we see today with other cases of mass neurosis (or is it psychosis?), such as that which enthralled the Germans under the Nazis. I think this clinical approach, which you are eminently suited for, is promising and might be worth pursuing.

I am not convinced that Chomsky et al. are merely sick, as opposed to lying. This is the subject that interests me most, now. It is obvious, I think, what a difference it makes. If they are merely sick, that is, lying to themselves, our–my, at least–view of the world is quite different than it is if they are lying, just as I would see and handle any sick person differently than I would a liar.

I have not misunderstood you. I understand that you mean they are both sick and liars, because they are lying to themselves. But the person in denial, lying to himself, is not lying to us. Once he successfully lies to himself, he only has to tell the truth, as he sees it. That is denial, as I understand your discussion of it. You put Chomsky et al. in that category, but I cannot agree with you. I believe they know better, that they are trying to mislead us. That is lying in the usual sense.

As further evidence that Chomsky and Cockburn et al. are not sick, but lying, I read the other night in the current issue of *The Nation* (Nov. 25, 1996)–your historical coverage of their role in the cover-up is brilliant, and much needed–that another member of this elevated intellectual clique is none other than the one researcher that all of us are convinced is a CIA asset, and the only researcher Chomsky ever mentioned in his correspondence with me: Edward J. Epstein.

This makes a neat triangle: Chomsky, Cockburn, and Epstein. Cockburn tells us his "old friend" Epstein is a "boon companion" of Teddy Goldsmith, the brother of Sir James, the "financier of right-wing parties in England and France." Of course, Cockburn can say he is at two removes from Evil, since he is only the friend of a friend of the brother, just as he was at one remove when he was living with Katharine Graham's daughter. But let us not miss the obvious: You and I do not mix in these circles, at whatever remove. Maybe Vince does, I don't know. It would be interesting to know. It is clear, at any rate, that there is an intellectual elite of the left just as there is of the right, and they are tied to wealth on both sides, which puts them out of almost all of our orbits.

Cockburn is a talented writer, but this part of the article makes strange reading. I had to actually diagram the sequence of events before I could understand what he is saying. He is saying that he, Cockburn, was probably responsible for Sir James making "millions" by getting out of the stock market just before the great crash on "Black Monday," Oct. 17, 1987. Cockburn heard the rumors in Key West, called Epstein, and Epstein passed the word along to the Goldsmiths. (Now, re-reading the article, I realize

that it is not clear which Goldsmith Epstein was a boon companion of, but it doesn't matter.)

How did Cockburn hear the rumors about AIDS being carried by mosquitoes in Key West? If he, as he says, had "not heard of any authoritative conclusion either way," why did he call anybody at all about it, and why did he call Epstein, in particular? He presumably tells this story in the expectation that his faithful readers will see a humorous irony in Cockburn's having unwittingly (or wittingly?) made millions for a capitalist pig, but on the other hand he makes no effort to make it seem ironic. Maybe it is one of those subconscious confessions (cf. the Augstein article), and not intended to be ironic at all but truthful. Cockburn is, after all, telling us who he is, and who Epstein is, and who Chomsky is. I'd be surprised if Chomsky and Epstein were not friends.

And who are they? The left hand of Big Brother, I'm afraid. This is a harder truth to face, I think, than the others–the truth about the coup, the media, AIDS, or what have you. The longer it stays with me, the more important I think it is. When you have been disabused of all the lies but this one, you've been marginalized but you still have a niche, the same one that Chomsky et al. occupy. Take that away and what have you got? Ground Zero.

I missed Vince's transparency theory in the book. That's important, because it is basically the same question I've been discussing re Chomsky et al. There is a big difference between conceiving of the enemy as a bungling but powerful oaf, and conceiving of a more clever and calculating power who purposefully made the conspiracy transparent.

I think Vince is probably right, and not only because I came to the same conclusion independently a couple of decades after he did. I called it the "let's-show'em-we've-got'em-by-the-balls" theory. It is not paranoid. The prima facie case is strong. The CIA had the means to kill Castro with undetectable poisons, so they had the means to dispatch JFK the same way. They chose to execute him publicly, create an outlandish fairy tale, and stuff it down our throats. They're still stuffing.

Why would they choose to do this, if they could have made him die quietly in his sleep, like Pope John Paul I? To make sure they scare the shit out of the few people who do see the truth. People like us.

You know that I disagree with you about the importance of the war. Frankly, I don't think your point of view is reasonable, especially when you add that the war was not only relatively unimportant as a motive for the assassination, but now even serves as a diversion. You call this the false debate. But what exactly do you mean? Why is it false to discuss the war as a cause of the assassination? Why is it less false to discuss JFK's rapprochement with Cuba and the Soviet Union as causes of the assassination? Why do you think they are separate issues?

I used the expression "false debate" quite differently in my letter to Newman and in our subsequent discussions. Not that I dispute your right to use the words the way you choose, but I don't think what you're saying makes much sense. Which do you think would have greater political impact–the confirmation that (a) JFK was killed by the warmongers, or that (b) he was killed because he was soft on communism, particularly on Russia and Cuba? I know that you think (b) is much more important, but what do you think most Americans would say? Which is more likely to get people out on the streets, (a) or (b)?

I am saying (a) is more important because of its potential political impact, and also more important because I don't think the assassination would have happened if JFK had gone along with the warmongers. You are saying not only that (b) is more important, but that (a) is a *diversion*. But are you not in fact saying that (a) is unimportant *because* it is a diversion, a diversion of course being a straying from the important? Looks like a textbook example of begging the question to me.

The falsity of the Vietnam debate, as I tried to make clear, is the way Chomsky and Newman have framed it–as a question of what JFK *would have done* if he had lived. This is a hypothetical and unanswerable question that can be debated ad infinitum and is indeed useless and diversionary. The real debate is the question of what JFK *did* do. Did he plan to withdraw all personnel by 1966? Did the CIA reverse their assessment of the war, retrospectively, beginning two days after the assassination? Did Johnson begin having doubts about the withdrawal policy within days of the assassination? Did he reverse it, officially, within the next four months?

The answer to all of these questions is yes, but Noam Chomsky disagrees. That is, or was, the real debate, and I guess it should not be too surprising that I won, since the facts are clear until Chomsky messes with them. It's Chomsky vs. me, not Newman. I may be having delusions of grandeur, but that's the way I see it. I also see that I won the debate, but nobody knows about it. Meanwhile, Chomsky conducted the phony debate with Newman, which he can safely be said to have won by now. *Rethinking Camelot* is the book everyone will refer you to as the "rebuttal" to Newman, Stone, and the "war conspiracy" thesis generally. But do you know of anyone else, besides me, who has rebutted the rebuttal? No. It's over, as far as the public and the aftermath of the Stone film is concerned. Thanks to Chomsky, the Vietnam connection has been blurred and deflected.

That is the diversion. The diversion leads *away* from asking about the connection between the assassination and the war, just the opposite of your thesis. The power elite do not want us to make the connection with the war. It is still too explosive. The real debate, between Chomsky and me, deals with that connection directly, because it concerns the facts. The false debate, between Chomsky and Newman, concerns speculation about what JFK might have done or secretly thought. The facts of what he did do are simple and clear, but for that very reason, inadmissible. They must be obscured. That is Chomsky's role, and he has performed it faithfully. Since he cannot allow the fact of a policy reversal to stand, he questions whether the policy existed in the first place. He determines that it did not, and therefore the question of its reversal, and connection to the assassination, disappears. It's a disappearing act, a magic show.

I don't think you were correct or fair to include Prouty as one of the players in what you call the Vietnam "diversion." You might as well have included me (and John Thomas), since you seem to mean anyone who connects the assassination and the war. But the diversion is not discussion of the war per se; it is *Chomsky and Newman's discussion* of the war. That's why I got into it. It's quite wrong to make people think the war connection is unimportant. Why do you think a big gun like Chomsky would be employed for such a job–defusing this explosive issue? It is very important. You say it is not important, and I say that you, truly unwittingly, are in effect doing the same thing Chomsky-Newman are doing–deflecting attention away from the war. Since I think the war is the most important issue, and you say it is a diversion, must I not conclude that

you are the one who is unwittingly acting in the interests of Big Brother? I think it would be best if we forgot this idea of "unwitting agents" altogether, because it can pretty easily be made to fit anyone.

I have a couple of problems with Prouty myself, as I indicated a couple of letters ago, but all he has said, it seems to me, is that the CIA likes to make war, which makes sense to me. He has not speculated, as far as I can recall, about what JFK would have done if he had lived, or about what JFK secretly thought. This is the territory of the false debate. I am in it, you might say, as a third party, a would-be whistleblower, but I don't see Prouty in it.

These quibbles aside, you have produced a very valuable and unique tome. Many heartfelt thanks, both for sending it and for writing it. It is a big contribution to sanity.

VS (11/26/96)

…My good friend Ray calls Marty a Marxist Leninist. Is Marty a Marxist Leninist? He will not see any need to reply to that since he thinks of the book as explaining himself.

If I ask myself whether I am a Marxist Leninist, I cannot see as other than imperfect any society which is organized without both considerable political and economic democracy. I, unlike my good friend Ray, cannot approve of our society's economic organization, which permits me to sit on mounds of money and allows others to suffer destructive economic deprivation. Why should I not be critical of a society which has Ray, who is far superior to me in intellect, work habits and integrity, not enjoy more economic success and I less?

In my view, wherever a form of political democracy exists along with great concentrations of wealth in the hands of a few, the affluent few tend to control the democratic processes with their money. Therefore, the democratic processes will tend to serve the interests of the rich and will not produce the greatest good for the greatest number. Such a democracy, to me, appears to be no democracy at all, or at best pseudo-democracy.

I don't see the market or the command system as necessarily leading to political democracy. Nor do I feel that a collective mode of production necessarily leads to economic democracy. I can see in a society with collectivized production new classes emerging which produce millionaire engineers, technocrats, and commissars. I strongly hope that the emergence of new propertied classes or power elites is not a necessary outgrowth of a collective organization of production.

But the dangers of bureaucratic growth and centralized power group control in a command society disturb me. Personally I don't see how you can produce goods and distribute them given the complexity of our technology without some bureaucratic apparatus. Is there such a thing as human nature which will require the persons in the planning apparatus to seek to perpetuate and to expand their power and privileges? I see this as one of the potentially basic problems in socialist organization of society.

I feel that collectivized production does not seem to meet all the needs of humankind. I also feel that the market system cannot meet humankind's needs. I suspect that the best hope for a fair society is in a mixed economy of some production for use and some for profit with practicable competition between the collectivized and the private sectors.

I favor considerable leveling of the disparity of income. I think that this is a test of political democracy. If there is true political democracy with an educated citizenry, I feel that the people will inevitably opt through their votes for a more equal and equitable distribution of wealth. This appears to be fairer than tolerating fat cats like Salandria and even fatter cats whose dollars can commandeer more goods and service than they can consume while others go hungry.

If all of the above makes me a Marxist Leninist, then I plead guilty to being a Marxist Leninist.

…Mike asks me what I mean by the TWA Flight 800 press clippings being a Rorschach. I mean that if we, after the fashion of Castro's examination of the press clippings following JFK's murder, scrutinize those clippings I mailed you, we can come to only one rational and lucid conclusion. Our armed forces shot Flight 800 down with a missile. The evidence for this explanation far outweighs the absence of evidence in support of the three alternative explanations.

The fourth explanation, which is the only one the media have ruled out, is the friendly fire thesis. As Marty says, the ruling out of friendly fire causation has to be based solely on asking the Pentagon whether their forces did it and accepting the Pentagon's denial and verity. Marty wonders why no reporter asks how friendly fire was ruled out as a possible cause when no other scenario, such as a bomb, a terrorist missile or mechanical failure has been dismissed.

Asking the Pentagon whether one of its units shot the plane down is equivalent to asking Dulles whether the CIA was involved in the killing of Kennedy. His and the Pentagon's denials are self-serving and therefore worthless. Marty points out that no reporter dares to ask what process was employed in ruling out friendly fire as the cause. Marty says that this demonstrates proof of the total lap-dog mentality of our media when it comes to the national security state's perceived needs.

But our news media have picked up cues that they are to ignore the evidence of a "friendly" fire shoot down. They have been cued to treat the matter as if there is probably a mechanical failure explanation which has not yet been but will be nailed down. In fact there is no evidence favoring any of the three theories. There is only evidence, eyewitness evidence, and plenty of it, to support the friendly fire thesis.

The media have been cued to deal with the three explanations other than friendly fire as all having equal validity. We are free to believe any of the three theories. But we are not permitted to know what happened and to ascribe it to friendly fire without being slandered or Salingerized, which is the celebrity form of being Salandriaized.

…Nov. 17, Fletcher sends us the mailing list of Bud Fensterwald. It is terribly interesting. Thank you, Fletcher. But I just don't want to be responsible for disseminating it to the whole group. I have always been convinced that Bud Fensterwald was a highly placed U.S. intelligence agent. His list includes agents and good people. Therefore, I don't feel that we should be sifting through the list naming who is who. We have better things to do.

…Nov. 25, in *The Nation*, Cockburn identifies Epstein as "my old friend." Epstein, whom I have known, is 100% sleaze. No one can mistake him for a friend of anyone but U.S. intelligence. Cockburn has to know that Epstein is an intelligence asset. Epstein never bothered to deny it when I knew him and so accused him….

1997

VS (1/22/97)

…Ray includes excerpts from John Newman's *Oswald and the CIA*. I think the most interesting and I think indefensible part of this excerpt is found on page 430 when Newman defends the CIA from institutional involvement and invites us to believe in the "renegade faction" hypothesis. I have no tolerance for such a spin-off concept and write off Newman out of hand for these utterances.

…Peter Grose's *Gentleman Spy* does away forever with the notion of Professor Chomsky that JFK was a cold warrior who could not be distinguished from the rest of the warfare state. Grose proves that the Dulles wing of the national security apparatus sought to betray Kennedy on the Bay of Pigs. They actually left a paper trail of this betrayal effort. Also, we learn from this book, Gaeton, that the U.S. spy Mary Bancroft, who just died, was the lover of Allen Dulles and Henry Luce. Is that the intelligence connection you need to understand why Claire Booth Luce went about fist-fucking you up the ass using sand as lubricant?

…I enclose some excerpts from Noam Chomsky's *Class Warfare* and Peter Grose's *Gentleman Spy*…. [and] some angry thoughts I have about [the former]…. Can some of you guys get to work on Chomsky, Cockburn and Epstein?

Professor Chomsky, Whose Side Are You On?

Professor Noam Chomsky has contended that he is not convinced that the killing of President Kennedy was a conspiracy. He has consistently adhered to his contention in the face of enormous evidence which demonstrates that the U.S. national security state killed the President and has been involved with its civilian allies in its cover-up.

Furthermore Professor Chomsky has maintained that if the assassination was a result of a conspiracy, it had no historical significance. And finally he has maintained that President Kennedy was a cold warrior whose foreign policy was indistinguishable from the military-intelligence structure which drove the foreign policy of the United States. Why has he adhered to these views in the face of overwhelming internal and external U.S. governmentally supplied evidence pointing plainly to the contrary?

In his book *Class Warfare*, Professor Chomsky helps us to understand at least some of the reasons why he has failed in this instance to respect the sanctity of obvious truth. In *Class Warfare* he speaks of his friendship with John Deutch, a former MIT provost who became director of the CIA:

We were actually friends and got along fine, although we disagreed on about as many things as two human beings can disagree about. I liked him. We got along very well together. He's very honest, very direct. You know where you stand with him. We talked to each other. When we had disagreements, they were open, sharp, clear, honestly dealt with. I found it fine. I had no problem with him. I was one of the very few people on the faculty, I'm told, who was supporting his candidacy for the President of MIT.

Professor Chomsky of course has a right to choose his friends. He has a right to choose one who was the director of an agency which has been directly responsible for carrying out as a matter of policy assassinations throughout the globe. But he does his

readers a disservice by [endowing] such a person with honesty and expecting his readers to join him in considering such a person "very honest." He had "no problem with him," but I as a reader, knowing the murderous role of the CIA and knowing that Mr. Deutch was acceptable as the CIA's director, should be forgiven by Professor Chomsky if I should view such a friendship as a problem.

Professor Chomsky supported Mr. Deutch's candidacy for the Presidency of MIT. But Professor Chomsky should understand my concern as a reader about an easy path from academia to the CIA. Such a path serves to erode into non-existence any concept of an academe independent of governmental influence and control. By accepting John Deutch as a "friend" and as a person whom he liked and whom he considered very honest he reduces politics to a debating game having little human content and consequence. This is a friendship which permits a leftist such as Professor Chomsky to be viewed as an acceptable and responsible player in the deadly war games which it plays covertly and overtly in maintaining its status as a super war power.

But let us put Professor Chomsky's choice of a person with whom he got along fine aside. Rather, let us now cut to the revelations in his book which because of a conflict of interest render him incapable of making fair judgments on certain subjects. These subjects are whether the U.S. military-intelligence power killed JFK and whether such a killing has any political significance. For this purpose the following remarks of Professor Chomsky deserve our attention:

David Barsamian: That research you were doing in the 1950s and 1960s, was any of it federally funded?

Professor Chomsky: Oh, yeah. Not only was it federally funded, it was militarily funded. In fact, whether anything is militarily-funded or not is pretty much a bookkeeping exercise. MIT runs primarily on soft money, not on endowments, not on tuition. How the soft money is distributed is a very mysterious matter which they don't even understand in the bookkeeping department, as I know, having once been on a committee that tried to look into it years later. In a certain sense, everything is militarily-funded, even the music department. The sense in which that's true is that if they didn't have military funding for, say, the electrical engineering department and had to go to other funds for that; that would cut off the departments like the music department. So it is primarily a bookkeeping matter. But if you look at books of mine that were written in the early 1960s, you'll notice a formal statement on the front page saying "This was funded with the support of," and then it has the three services. The reason is that the laboratory itself is funded by the three services, or was, maybe still is, for all I know.

Consider what Professor Chomsky has told us. His work was and still is funded by the Pentagon. MIT runs primarily on the Pentagon's soft money and "in a certain sense, everything is militarily-funded." "Everything" includes not only Professor Chomsky's works published through MIT, but his professional perquisites and salary received from that repository of Pentagon lucre. In short, Professor Chomsky has been and continues to be in the pay of the Pentagon.

Given the above, what weight should be given in the court of public opinion to Professor Chomsky's assessment that there is no convincing evidence that the CIA and the Pentagon killed President Kennedy? What weight should be given Professor Chomsky's oft-repeated assertion that the killing of JFK is of no historic interest or significance?

It would appear to me that in light of Professor Chomsky's admitted economic dependence upon the Pentagon, he has no standing to dismiss as feckless the search for truth in the killing of President Kennedy. By so doing he has severely damaged his reputation. But more importantly, his failure to have the decency to remain at least silent on this subject, he has armed the assassins with the opinion of an internationally renowned truth hunter. He has contributed to their perpetuation of their on-going abusive power and done important work for the Pentagon to which he is monetarily beholden.

MM (3/18/97)

Howard Zinn's letter to Marty, included in the last packet, makes it pretty clear that I have not been making too much of the Chomsky correspondence. I hope everyone has noticed how much Zinn relies on Chomsky's argument that there was *no policy reversal in Vietnam* to conclude that the assassination is a non-issue–"a diversion from more important tasks." In fact, Zinn's opinion is an exact replica of Chomsky's.

Are we dealing here with intellectual clones? No, we are dealing with intellectual leadership. Chomsky is not called the "leading" intellectual dissident for nothing. Zinn is another one who counts, but he is willing to rest on Chomsky's argument on the withdrawal question, which is obviously crucial to his own opinion.

Marty says he doesn't think Chomsky is a "paid, conscious agent." On the other hand, he says he is being dishonest, that he is lying. How can you lie, and not be aware of it? If you lie, you are saying something that you know isn't true. How can that be "unconscious"? In other words, how can you be lying and *not* be a "conscious agent"?

If, on the other hand, Chomsky is his own best example (if he realized it) of a propagandized intellectual, i.e., an "unconscious agent," he has no reason to lie. Once the consent has been manufactured in the victim's brain, he merely has to say what he honestly thinks. This is the message of Chomsky's own book, *Manufacturing Consent*, it was my point to Chomsky about Schlesinger, and it was also my first conclusion about Chomsky himself, as expressed in my last letter to the great man. Since then I have come to a different conclusion, and it all turns on this question of lying or not, dishonest or not. Lying is not manufactured consent. It is conscious, willful complicity.

As for "paid" or "unpaid," it is clear that there are many ways to reward people other than with a paycheck. People like money, but they also like to feel important and powerful, and *righteous*. They will lie like rugs if they think they are doing "the right thing."

What is Chomsky's motivation? I still respect the man too much to believe he would lie without a damned good reason. This leads to an uncomfortable paradox: If the reason is good enough for Chomsky et al., it would probably be good enough for me. This means that if I knew the reason they were lying, I would have to lie, too. My search for the truth would end in a lie. I would become part of the Big Lie. Is this is what I want? Why am I racing down this dead-end street?

When you have the government and the "radical leftist dissidents" saying exactly the same thing about an issue as important as this, you have an all-out propaganda campaign.

Thus we in this group are at the cutting edge. We are close to the very face of Big Brother. How does BB get to Chomsky's ilk? None of the explanations I have heard or proposed myself, from physical threats to Martians in the White House, is convincing.

John Thomas says Vince suspected that Roosevelt knew about Pearl Harbor beforehand–in the 8th grade! I would like to hear more about that.

It occurs to me that Chomsky's and Parenti's responses to my letter to Newman were identical. They supposedly disagree about the assassination (and the withdrawal policy reversal?), but something in my challenge to Newman stirred both Chomsky and Parenti to do two things:

1) ignore the substantive issues

2) leap to counterattack with the poor argument that my suspicions of Newman were no more justified than the same suspicions one might have of me

Am I a career military intelligence officer who woke up one day and decided to lead the fight against the government to disclose the truth about the JFK assassination? What have I ever done, said or written that would justify questions similar to those I asked Newman? But if asked, I would answer–and that's a big difference.

Thus Chomsky and Parenti are both ready to fling a totally unjustified counteraccusation at me, although my questions to Newman, though challenging, were not accusatory. They were as reasonably and respectfully formulated as I could make them. Reading Chomsky and Parenti, one would think I had thrown a baseless and unsupported accusation at Newman, but I did nothing of the kind. This will be apparent to anyone who reads the letters.

Why did Chomsky and Parenti both act as if I had kicked Newman in the balls when he wasn't looking? Why hasn't Parenti taken advantage of the opportunity to participate in the correspondence, since Vince has been sending him the packets? Doesn't he recognize that he is among friends? Doesn't he like us? Maybe that's what it boils down to: who you like. Parenti "met Newman in Washington and liked him very much." Chomsky "liked" John Deutch.

I like the Calabrian's style. Who the fuck's side are you on, anyway, Chomsky? The question is perfectly appropriate. We are angry with Chomsky, and we have a right to be. We want to make him talk, and show his colors, one way or the other. This is the most honorable way to behave when you suspect betrayal. You confront the person directly, openly, with your suspicions, and ask for an explanation. That is what I did with Newman, but I didn't quite get to that point with Chomsky. Vince is taking the next step.

Vince wrote on Oct. 8, 1996 to Canadian reporter Joe Martines:

The weekend of the assassination, I discussed the matter with my then brother-in-law, Harold Feldman. We thought that Lee Harvey Oswald had the appearance of a United States government agent. We decided to keep our minds open about whether he was a patsy or one of more assassins. However, we agreed that if that weekend, a Jew came on the scene and killed Oswald, then we would have to look to a high level government Anglo-Saxon government conspiracy of a military-intelligence nature.

When on Sunday, November 25, 1963, Jack Ruby appeared on my television screen and shot Oswald, I remember muttering 'There's the Jew.'

Now, why a Jew? Well, at that time there was a substantial contingent of intelligent, radical, honest Jewish intellectuals who could be expected to be highly critical of a military-intelligence killing of the President. The choice of Oswald's assassin as a Jew demonstrated to me a need to intimidate the left wing of American politics.

Of course, when a clever and dishonest lawyer was needed by the government to weave three bullets into many wounds of three men, President Kennedy, Governor

Connolly and a bystander, James T. Tague, the U.S. government chose another Jew, Arlen Specter, to accomplish that impossible task. This choice again demonstrated the government's need to intimidate the same independent thinkers into staying clear of the assassination inquiry. I could have no doubts after his unbelievable conclusions that the assassination of President Kennedy was the work of the highest elements of the U.S. military-intelligence power...

The assassination of President Kennedy was a message from the national security state by the action of its executive arm, the military-intelligence forces, to the civilian part of the American governmental structure, to the American people and to the peoples of the earth that U.S. military power was autonomous, no longer constitutionally constrained and knew no limitations in its killing of those who sought to restrain it.

The only hint of a "Jewish" factor in the assassination I have heard of before this came from a source I don't trust. One of *The Spotlight's* reporters, Michael Piper, wrote a book called *The Last Judgment*, in which he fingers the Mossad, in cahoots with the CIA, the motive being JFK's unsympathetic policies towards Israel and specifically towards their secret atomic bomb program.

I do not take this theory very seriously, since I am convinced that every intelligence agency on the face of the earth is in cahoots with the CIA. But surely it is the CIA that is running the show, not the Mossad.

You are going in the opposite direction, Vince, but the argument is not clear. Why would the involvement of Jews and Italians in the assassination and cover-up intimidate other Jews and Italians? Did the fact that Bugsy Siegel and Meyer Lansky (a key figure in Piper's theory) were Jews cause other Jews to ignore, trivialize, or lie about the Jewish Mafia? If Chomsky and Mailer and I. F. Stone are so intimidated by the complicity of Jews like Ruby and Specter, how does this explain the identical ostrich-like positions of Cockburn and Augstein, who are not Jews?

Re TWA 800 and the friendly fire theory, I tend to believe it. There is the eyewitness testimony Vince mentioned, and when do they otherwise disregard eyewitness testimony, except in the shooting of presidents? Then there is the common sense that with the technology available today, they could not recover 95% of the aircraft without being able to say whether it was hit by a missile. They must know.

But Pierre Salinger is not the right man to lead this battle. How can he be trusted, when his message to the world about the assassination was:

In the United States, most Americans at first believed the Warren Commission's finding that President Kennedy had been killed by a madman, Lee Harvey Oswald, working alone. But over the years, and with the plot mentality that grew out of the Watergate affair and the congressional investigations of the CIA in the 1970s, some Americans moved to the European view–yes, there was a conspiracy [review of Turner film, IHT, Nov. 2, 1988].

Salinger must know that polls have consistently shown that *most* Americans believe it was a conspiracy.

No one can argue that the Warren report left many questions unanswered. But the British documentary went further, saying that Lee Harvey Oswald had nothing to do with the Kennedy assassination, though the young man's role was reconfirmed by the findings of an in-depth congressional investigation in the 1970s.

If he saw the film, he knows it does not say Oswald had "nothing to do with the assassination." It says he was what he said he was: a patsy. Salinger must also have known that the "in-depth congressional investigation" was simply an extension of the cover-up, even before Gaeton Fonzi's book.

That there might have been a killer on the grassy knoll...remains open to question, as the congressional committee indicated in the 70s. This has not, however, been proven, and it certainly is not proven by the shadowy [Moorman] Polaroid.

The only thing this opens to question is Salinger himself. As if the Moorman photo was the only evidence.

We now know that two of them [the suspected Corsican assassins] were nowhere near the scene of the crime. One was aboard a French minesweeper in the harbor of Toulon (as verified by the Defense Ministry in Paris). The second was in prison in Marseille (as the Justice Ministry confirmed). The third man, a French newspaper has established, was on sick leave from his job in Marseille as a docker, having lost an eye. Is it possible to believe that such a man was recruited to kill the American president?

Can Salinger have such a naive faith in government agencies and newspaper reporters, in a case where the government itself stands accused?

Salinger has "no doubt that 100 years from now investigators will still be trying to determine who killed John Kennedy." Why does he have no doubt? This is unsettling–in the same way that it was unsettling when Ted Kennedy said after the Stone film, "I think you'll find, in the end, that the Warren Commission was the most responsible party." What did he mean by "responsible"? He didn't say, "This is what I think..." He said, "This is what I think you will find out." In other words, he knows something, or is convinced he does. What makes them so certain?

In a recent issue of the *Covert Action Quarterly* (formerly *Covert Action Information Bulletin*), a magazine that up to now I have thought very highly of, David Gilbert, a prison inmate, attempts to debunk various conspiracy theories of AIDS. This is so badly done that it has shaken my faith in the integrity of the magazine.

It was Noam Chomsky, in his first letter to me, who introduced me to this magazine.

Leonard Horowitz's well-researched book *Emerging Viruses* is not mentioned at all by Gilbert, but in the next issue, a letter to the editor refers to Horowitz in passing as a "possibly LaRouche-affiliated dentist." Is this argumentation?

Another letter-writer, Nathaniel Lederer, reminds readers that he "demolished the Segal hypothesis of a synthetically created AIDS virus" in that very same magazine (CAIB) in 1987. He did nothing of the kind.

CAQ/CAIB has always steered clear of the assassinations, and now it seems they are determined to treat conspiracy theories of AIDS as a non-issue, too.

Is this Chomsky's influence?

Ellen Ray and Bill Schaap, the publishers, are tight with Chomsky. But where are the Ellen Ray and Bill Schaap who published Garrison and took the Stone film seriously (in the now defunct *Lies of Our Times*), for which Alexander Cockburn viciously and unfairly attacked them in *The Nation*?

I wrote to Chomsky first about AIDS, not JFK. What was his reaction? At first, he said the "new and surprising" information I had sent him on the Segal theory, and the MacArthur testimony of 1969, "sends a chill up the spine." It was all new to him,

apparently. Then he dropped the whole thing like a hot potato, from one letter to the next. Then it was just "No opinion," "Not my field," over and out. What happened?

In hindsight, the parallels with the JFK act are clear. Chomsky was interested in the information that Ray Marcus brought him in 1969. Then he dropped it, just as abruptly as he did the AIDS thing. How does one lose interest in something so important, so quickly and completely? How can some "new and surprising" information send "a chill up the spine" one minute, and be dismissed as "out of one's field" the next?

"Well, now," Prof. Zinn might say, "he's protecting the Movement."

"But Prof. Zinn," a recalcitrant student, Unsinn, might protest, "there is no Movement."

"No reason to distract the few activists that are left from more important issues," says Zinn.

"Like what?" queries Unsinn rudely. "What could be more important than understanding the nature of the state we live in? Either it was a coup d'état or it wasn't. You don't think that question is important?"

There is no reply. Prof. Zinn has no more time to waste on Unsinn. He has lectures to prepare and articles and books to write. He is a busy man.

Some more notes on the CAQ-Chomsky crowd: Michael Piper says that Ray and Schaap, Garrison's publishers, have among their financial backers the Stern Family Fund, a "foundation established by Clay Shaw's friends." Piper sees a connection between Stern, the Mossad, and Shaw through Permindex. What is one to make of this?

A couple of years ago I spent a couple of evenings with Phillip Agee, who founded the predecessor of CAIB/CAQ, and his wife Giselle in Hamburg, where they live. Agee agrees Dallas was a plot, perhaps of renegade CIA operatives, but he does not see a larger conspiracy. He is a big fan of Chomsky.

Bill Vornberger, a former editor at CAIB, wrote to me on Oct. 25, 1989, saying much the same thing:

Thank you for your letter of September 23 and for your review of *The Men Who Killed Kennedy*. Like you, we are very much aware of the fact that Kennedy was killed by members of a conspiracy. In fact, it is our opinion that these men were current or former employees of the CIA.

This is Stage 3 of the cover-up (rogue elephant/renegade agents), and puts the editors of CAIB/CAQ squarely in the camp of John Newman. This does not look good.

Chomsky, Cockburn, Mailer, Augstein, etc. are still at Stage 1 (Oswald did it)– that is, in terms of their publicly expressed positions. Stage 2 (the Mafia did it) never seems to have gotten off the ground, despite the efforts of Robert Blakey, David Scheim, etc. Stage 3 is the last stage before the truth (coup d'état), so the strategy is naturally to hold on as long as possible.

Perhaps the fact that this is merely a holding (stonewalling) operation explains why Chomsky (and Zinn) find it so uninteresting and unimportant. This also fits with Vince's theory that Chomsky was assigned to hold the line on the crucial issue of Vietnam withdrawal (but not only with me). My overall impression of the letters is that they show someone honing his own position, or practicing, as with a sparring partner, rather than someone who wants to exchange ideas, to understand his interlocutor and help his interlocutor understand him. No wonder he was bored.

VS (3/21/97)

…My pro bono efforts for the dying School District of Philadelphia have kept me horribly busy. I sense that the District's work is important as a rear guard action to delay slightly the power structure's dismantling of the public educational systems in the large urban areas. We apparently have no need for the public school city students in the cybernetic world, and these children of poverty are not going to be armed as I was with a solid public school education….

…Feb. 13, I thank Morrissey for his Chomsky letters. I don't think that there can be much doubt that in this exchange Morrissey triumphed over Chomsky.

…[Morrissey] sends us his wonderful letters directed to brilliant Professor Chomsky who would never stoop to the lowly and simple but crushingly definitive tasks of: examining holes in Kennedy's garments, determining why autopsy notes are burned, a brain disappears, a hit from the rear causes a body to be ripped leftward and backward, ascertaining why our government before it has any evidence rushes to foreclose any option other than LHO as the lone assassin, determining why the Zapruder film was not immediately shown to the whole world, taking note of how the government ignores the many eyewitnesses who report shots from other than the rear, explaining why x-rays are kept from the "investigating" commission, determining why governmental autopsy exhibits clash with one another and with the holes in the garments, figuring out why Connally's clothing is dry-cleaned and pressed, fathoming why CE 399 is essentially undiminished in weight and shape and bears no evidence of tissue, blood or fabric weave, giving meaning to the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court being treated worse than the lowliest shyster and is instructed to conclude prior to the investigation that he is to conclude that one man killed the President, etc. etc. Professor Chomsky's fine mind is above undertaking such pedestrian no-brainer tasks.

…Robert Cocco and Ralph Brown send us Internet material on the TWA shoot down. Is there any member of our group that does not now know that our navy shot down that plane? …

MM (5/19/97)

Returning to the question of the state of the *Rechtsstaat* in America, I did not follow the O.J. trial closely, but I agree that it looks like he did it. The problem I have is how this circus of a trial has been treated by the media. We know that the (mainstream) media and the government are for all intents and purposes the same thing, and we have to ask ourselves why it happened, that is, was *allowed* to happen. Why was this circus not only tolerated but jammed down our throats? It is obviously not in the interest of a healthy, honest government to allow its legal system to be exposed as corrupt and unworkable, and certainly this could have been prevented. Is Judge Ito more powerful than the US government? It was clearly in the interest of Big Brother to let it happen, just as it must in his interest to allow Jay Leno (etc.) to tell tens of millions of people every night that all lawyers are shysters, that O.J. is guilty, and that our legal system is shot to hell. Why this message, consistently, and not any number of other "funnier" ones? It is inconceivable that NBC et al. would put out a message as consistent and obvious as this without a reason.

The reason, as I see it, is to prepare the American people for the coming top-down "revolution": it's a mess anyway, so we won't be losing anything when the changes come and hopefully won't protest too much. It is mind conditioning for the New World Order, the final form of which we haven't seen yet by a long shot.

This should not sound paranoid to anyone who has witnessed the events of the last decade. Who would have predicted the fall of communism and the Soviet Union? The United States has already fallen. It fell on Nov. 22, 1963 at the latest, and probably before that, as your analogy of the Warren Commission with the Roberts Commission shows.

You have known this for a long time, Vince. You have been a "nut" since the eighth grade. That is amazing. I didn't become a nut until I was 42. I am already showing signs of burning out, but you've been in the ring (the nuts vs. the rest of the world) for more than 50 years, and still going strong. And you call me *your* leader? Maybe we all lead each other, to some extent, but you are nuttier than any of the rest of us and have been for a long time, so there can be no question who the real leader is.

Herewith Lawrence Durrell on yoga, but to me it describes "leadership" in the best sense:

Then meditation, like crossing the dark garden of consciousness shielding a lighted candle which the least puff of wind might extinguish. You protect this small precarious flame, treasuring it in the palm of the hand. So very gradually your meditation affirms and strengthens the flame and you can cross the dark garden with it triumphantly erect... (*Quince*, p. 19)

I like this image. The "leader" as candle-holder. For example, I repeat here what you have written about the cover-up strategy because it is cutting edge.

In short, Oswald represented a possible connection to any aspect of the U.S. political spectrum. So this sheep-dipping (Garrison's phrase) connection with all aspects of the U.S. political scene served to make the subject of investigating the assassination a quicksand for any political group. The intelligence community was in a position to provide data which would implicate any political group in the killing.

At the time of the killing of JFK the left in the U.S. was heavily Jewish. The killing of JFK was a foreign-policy killing. The killing was designed to allow the Cold War to continue unabated. It was necessary to paralyze the left into inaction. The picking of Oswald as the assassin with connections leading ostensibly to the left helped to serve this function. Choosing Ruby and Specter for their roles was a way of pointing away from the WASP perpetrators of the killing and giving the assassination an ethnic twist. Later this would be reinforced by throwing in the Mafia as possible candidates for the killing. Ruby and Specter were the Jewish markers of the cover-up which would tend to discourage Jewish leftists from delving into the assassination which through Ruby and Specter had its Jewish connection.

Complete political paralysis was also reinforced when the Warren Commission gave the left the carrot of no conspiracy and therefore no pogrom of the left. At the same time the Warren Commission shoveled tons of data indicating conspiracy. So you have Orwellian paralysis being offered to the public of believing two opposite propositions to be true and to be believed. The government concluded one person killed JFK, and that there was no conspiracy. The government concluded this sole-assassin proposition in the face of a vast pile of conspiracy evidence. This is a prime example of classical Orwellian doublethink.

The left got the idea immediately. Either buy the Oswald myth or a pogrom against the left would follow. Either accept this political untruth or accept political doom. Was it not better, more politically responsible, not to know the truth and to be able to

continue to be politically effective? After all, history will record that the nuts who pursued the truth got nowhere.

The nuts who knew that Pearl Harbor was a set-up and who would have sought to pursue this truth during World War II would have been imprisoned and would have hindered the American war effort in a good war. They would have aided Hitler. If the Japanese relocation camps during World War II were called what they were, the first racial concentration camps in this country, the people calling them such would have been imprisoned for hindering the war effort.

So too, the nuts who announced in the heat of the Cold War that the center of American power was behind the Kennedy assassination were striking a blow against open societies and were inviting our military-intelligence network to suspend the Constitution. If these nuts had their way, they would have been instrumental not only in the destruction of the American left, but they would have shredded the Constitution. If these nuts had their way, Castro's Cuba would have been invaded. If these nuts had their way the Soviets might have reacted to the invasion of Cuba with a hydrogen bomb response, and the very existence of the planet as viable living space would have been jeopardized.

As far as I'm concerned, this is a state-of-the-art description of the political reality we are all trying to get a bead on. What else could possibly be going on in the heads of Chomsky et al. They are not stupid, they are not ignorant, they are not naive. They must think they are serving a higher purpose. Either that or someone has slipped a million dollars into their bank accounts, or threatened to break their kneecaps–neither of which I think are likely. But a higher purpose, yes. A purpose higher than the right of the individual to understand the world he lives in (although I thought this was one of the things Chomsky believed in), the purpose of avoiding chaos and disaster, yes, that is conceivable. We have to dress it up a bit to fit the Chomsky paradigm, but it boils down to the same old refrain: National Security.

It's still hard to swallow the notion that Chomsky is one of the enemy, but recently I have begun to think of my problem with him in analogy with the way I once felt about McGeorge Bundy. In both cases, the question was, "How can he be so stupid?"–in Bundy's case, as to think the Vietnam War was necessary, and in Chomsky's case, as to think the assassination had no significance and that there was no withdrawal policy reversal. The answer, in both cases, was that he cannot be. The result, also in both cases, was an on-going conundrum.

The solution to the conundrum is not rational but emotional. It is a matter of deciding whether someone is your friend or your enemy. What decides that? I don't know. At some point it happens, after you get to know people a while. Chomsky likes John Deutch. Parenti likes Newman. I did not like McGeorge Bundy, but I respected him, because everybody else seemed to respect him, and more importantly, I considered him to be on "our side." As soon as that illusion broke, there was no more conundrum. He wasn't stupid. He was lying. That was the end of my problem with Bundy. I know longer cared what made him tick, no matter how brilliant he was or people said he was, any more than I cared what made Goebbels tick.

I confess that I am not quite there yet with Chomsky. I guess what holds me back is all that stuff he wrote that I agree with. It is hard to see him as a liar, as the last bastion of the National Security State which he otherwise pretends to join us in condemning. But what is the alternative? It is the same as it was with Bundy. We are convinced that he is

lying. You and the others have confirmed this, so at least I know I wasn't imagining things. We have seen a Noam Chomsky that one does not see in his published writings. That's why he screamed bloody murder when I "published" one of his letters, and would scream even louder if he knew I had shown them all to you. What else can the lying mean? I keep asking myself that question, and there is only one answer that makes sense. He is the enemy, just as McGeorge Bundy was the enemy, and for the same reason.

It's all quite dizzying. The circle keeps getting smaller. First, Bundy et al., our own government, become the enemy, and then Chomsky et al., who are supposedly Bundy's enemies and thus our friends. Are they the same enemy? Who are our friends now?

I am not as sure as you are that there is no mole among us. It is in Big Brother's interest to keep track of us, precisely because we are cutting edge. We are the candles in the garden, and there are damned few. Either we are all really nuts, or Big Brother is a reality. Dallas tells us Big Brother is real. Chomsky says Dallas tells us nothing–and that is how we know he is lying. Given that BB is real, then, it is only logical that he would like to see where our thinking leads us. Of course he must make sure none of our little candles become beacons. But it also behooves him to keep track of us in order to learn what to expect from others, later, when others hit Ground Zero. How can the people down here be best controlled?

Thus, I hope, BB is disinclined to shoot us or otherwise shut us up. We are not dangerous. John Thomas's and my idea of reaching out to the Vietnam vets through COPA is probably as close to dangerous as we have become.

If we have a mole amongst our 20 correspondents, I suspect it is a quiet one who just passes our stuff on to higher-ups. I wouldn't be surprised if Chomsky gets his copy of your mailings the day after the rest of us do. There's nothing we can do about that, if it is true, and I agree with you that we shouldn't let it bother us. Let them listen. Maybe they'll learn something. Maybe we can plant a seed of doubt this way in the ranks of the True Believers.

On the other hand, maybe we'll only help them refine the cover-up to such a degree of sophistication that even we, or people like us (there being a few nuts in every generation), will fall for it, there will be no more candles in the garden, and the National Security State will be complete. We will be able to build pyramids again!

I don't want that to happen, but the only way I know to prevent it is to continue doing what we're doing. I'm not going to get paranoid about moles. But we cannot live here, at Ground Zero, and not know they are around, and that they can turn up in the most unpredictable places. The only thing we can do is talk. We cannot look behind each other's backs and see who has his fingers crossed. Talk is all we've got. A certain amount of mutual suspicion is bound to come up, and I fully agree that we should deal with it forthrightly whenever it does, and try to fight like gentlemen. When we stop doing that, it's war.

Now I want to address Fletch Prouty.

I'll get right to the point. My enthusiasm for Marty's book has been considerably dampened by the realization that he has done you a serious injustice. I have told him so, and explained why. There was no reason at all to pick you to represent the "warmongers did it" theory (although that in itself would be a honor, not slander). He could just as well

have picked Garrison or Stone–or me, for that matter. But of course it was much worse to choose Newman for the honor, and then pair you with him as suspected spooks.

You have been hurt, unfairly, and I think Marty owes you either an explanation or an apology, or both. I hope he corrects the situation in a second edition. He got everything about Vietnam wrong. He misunderstood what I was saying about the "false debate" between Newman and *Chomsky* (nothing to do with you) and then, for reasons known only (or not) to himself, chose Newman and *you* as protagonists in his own theory of the "false debate," which is in fact the opposite of mine and not only wrong but just what the enemy wants to hear. Marty, who talks about "unconscious agents," has played right into their hands: Sure, discussion of the relation of the war and the assassination is just a "distraction"; let's forget it. The CIA will be very pleased with this help from Marty. Chomsky will be glad too, since that is also his message: Forget about any connection between Vietnam and the assassination. That is exactly what Marty is saying, when he says all discussion of that connection is nothing but a "distraction."

Marty's antipathy may be based simply on the fact that you used to wear a uniform, like Newman. This is like a racial stereotype. He reacts with fear and loathing not to what you say but to the color of your skin–that is, your uniform. He refuses to see that your opus, though not condemnatory of the military, condemns the intelligence apparatus that controls the military (and the US and the world, as the subtitle of your first book says) in the strongest terms.

Newman does the opposite. He blames the military (in the Vietnam book). In his Oswald book–though I have not been able to force myself to read much of it–he blames CIA "renegades," not the CIA as an institution. That is exactly what he said he was going to do at that first COPA conference. He predicted, with no justification or explanation at all, that the institution was clean but that certain individuals within it may be guilty. How could he predict that? How could he have any idea?

So we have, on the one hand, a military man blaming intelligence, and on the other hand, a clearly military *intelligence* man from NSA blaming the military. One of you has it ass-backwards.

There is another significant difference between you and Newman. You are talking to us. Even to Marty. Newman isn't talking, at least not to us. I am surprised that Marty, as a psychiatrist, fails to appreciate this difference.

I support and encourage you in fighting Marty's accusations. I feel somewhat responsible, since I got you into the group, but I am not the only friend you have here. In fact, I think everybody (that we have heard from, anyway) except Marty considers you a friend. You have defended yourself admirably, and if I may return the compliment, in a truly gentlemanly manner. The shoe is now on Marty's foot. Let's see what he does with it. It is very wise and generous of you to see that this kind of confrontation, as long as people remain civil, as Vince wisely implores us to do, can be healthy and a stimulus for growth.

Marty is not incapable of admitting he is wrong. He demonstrated this to me when he admitted not understanding my quarrel with Chomsky until he read my letter (about the book). I'm still not sure if he understands or agrees with me about the "false debate," but he is not immovable. He can change his mind–which is more than you can say of most people.

Another thing he should change in a second edition is the reference to me as living in Germany "since the Vietnam War." This makes me sound almost heroic, but the truth is that I came here for the job. It had nothing to do with the war.

I still think the book is on the whole a valuable contribution, but seeing how you have been misrepresented and hurt by it, plus the fact that he screwed up the whole Vietnam and "false debate" thing, I hope a revision is not long in coming.

I hope you don't let this rift with Marty drive you away. Looking at the broad range of scandals, outrages, and history-twisting conspiracies in the issue of *Prevailing Winds* you sent, I am impressed again with the uniqueness of the Salandria correspondence. We are having the conversation that people will have after they have read and reacted to and digested all those books and no longer need to be convinced how bad things are. I mean, how many outrages do you need to roil around in before you realize they are endless? I don't want to make a career of following them. I don't want to spend my time trying to keep track of the shenanigans of sundry thugs and liars. I'm glad some people do, since otherwise we wouldn't know anything at all, but I am interested in the next step, whatever that may be.

That is what we are about, I feel. Vince calls it the macroanalysis; I call it Ground Zero. Where it may lead I don't know. That's part of it. In any case, I don't know of any other place, even on the Internet, where such a conversation is taking place. I think it is important to continue this conversation, and I like having you in it, so please stay with us.

You say there are a couple of things that you and I have disagreed on. That's true. You did not respond to some questions I put to you a few letters back, and I dropped it because I did not want to badger a man who has just had his 80th birthday, and whom I consider a friend, even though what you *seemed* to be saying then contradicted everything else you had previously said and written.

I am referring to your statement that "the CIA didn't do it," that they were (are) just the "hangmen." I reminded you of the subtitle of your first book, and you said that was the publisher's suggestion. I was and remain astonished that a man who has said so much to condemn the CIA now seems to be exonerating them, or at least diverting attention away from them and into the much more nebulous direction of the "High Cabal."

If all you meant was that the "High Cabal" gives the orders, you don't have to say it at all, because it is in the name itself: the CIA is obviously the *agent* of the secret powers-that-be, and since it is equally obviously their job to maintain the complete anonymity of their masters, we will never know who or what the High Cabal is until we get rid of the CIA–"and it's allies," as you put it. But by shifting the emphasis from the tangible, identifiable enemy to a totally unknown and unknowable "higher" enemy, you invite suspicion.

The article about Richard Nuccio in the current *Nation* (5/19/97), amazingly enough when you stop to think about it, confirms almost routinely the central truth that the CIA controls the government. They control the president, the State Department, and the congressional "oversight" committees.

The CIA *did* do it. They shot JFK because he was standing in the way of the war they had undertaken to suck him (and us) into for the financial benefit of the people they work for, who are obviously not the president. You say they didn't do it because they were only following orders, but you must know as well as I do that no one will ever know

or have any proof of who gave the orders as long as the CIA exists. Your point about the High Cabal is totally vacuous. It leads nowhere, and is easily misunderstood.

As several people have said, we have plenty of evidence of conspiracy at Dealey Plaza, but the shirt and jacket evidence suffices to prove it. There is also plenty of evidence that the CIA was centrally involved in all phases of the operation–planning, execution, and cover-up. But one piece of evidence may suffice here, too.

Who could have given the order to stand down to the military unit that was supposed to protect the president in Dallas? I have never gotten an answer to that question, but I am beginning to think it's because the answer is too obvious. What's this big thing sticking out of the middle of my face?

You should be able to answer this question, and I don't understand why you haven't. I am not an expert, but it is clear to me that this order could only have come from the president himself or the CIA. Not the Secret Service, not the FBI, or any other military or civilian unit outside the chain of command. The CIA has responsibility for national security, and that is the only thing that can override the chain of command. Could this order have come down the chain of command? I don't think so. You should know. If it was a military order it would be traceable. Now, who does a military officer obey, outside the chain of command? Politicians? No. Business moguls? No. The FBI? No. The Secret Service? No. Other military units (outside their own chain of command)? Certainly not.

You should have had experience with this as a military man involved in intelligence work. What could have caused you to obey an order that did not come from your commanding officer? Who would have had this power over you? And of course over your commanding officer, since his duty would then have been to remain passive in the face of the overriding power. The president would have this power (theoretically), and the CIA (realistically). Nobody else. It would have to be a certain level of the CIA, too, and you would have to be 100% convinced that it was the Agency as an *institution*, functioning normally, and not some freak operation by "renegades."

As fate sometimes has it, right in the middle of writing this I happened to read two articles on the same page in the *Herald Tribune* (5/14/97, p. 3), both originally from the *Washington Post*), that are apropos. One of them tells us how the executive editor of the *San Jose Mercury News*, which published the articles accusing the CIA of indirectly selling crack cocaine in Los Angeles via its agents, the Nicaraguan contras, now says the articles were "oversimplified." This is another clear demonstration of who is in charge. Who would have the power to pressure this guy into making such an obviously forced about-face? The only agency I know of that has this kind of absolute power is the CIA. There is no point whatever in saying they are only following orders. They have the power.

The second article reports on Rep. Skaggs' attempts to get information from the CIA, and the anonymous *Post* author volunteers:

In the federal government, there is perhaps nothing so wonderfully Byzantine as a secret. You literally don't know what you don't know. And if you did know what you don't know, you still couldn't know it. That's called the need to know, and unless you have it, you may never know.

This tells us a second important truth–that our chances of penetrating this Byzantine shield and seeing what's behind it are very slim, as long as it exists. That is

why it exists. It is a shield. If we want to see the face of the High Cabal, the shield must go. There is no point in speculating about what is behind the shield as long as the shield is in place.

So much for the High Cabal. I feel the same way about Don Gibson's efforts to discover who was "behind" the Warren Commission. Johnson appointed them, and they did the damage. There's that nose on our face again. Who controlled LBJ? After Dallas, no intelligent person should have any doubt about that.

The CIA is like a man that walks up to you and kicks you in the balls. You wonder why. You wonder if someone ordered him to, and if so, who and why. Wonder, wonder, wonder. This is all well and good, except that this big guy is still there, kicking away. What the kickee should be thinking most about is how to kick back, and kick the shit out of this fellow, because that is the only way to stop the kicking, and the only way to stop the wondering. The kicker will never let us find out who or what makes him kick, unless we beat him. That is the law of the jungle. I may be an academic but I am not too stupid to understand that.

Another thing I asked you about was your source for claiming that the OAS was ready to send troops to defend the invading Cubans at the Bay of Pigs. You also believe, I think, that the invasion would have succeeded if all Castro's planes had been destroyed, that is, if Bundy hadn't cancelled the air strikes.

I think you are absolutely wrong about this, and again it sounds–incredibly, coming from you–like a defense of the CIA. First of all, Bundy *was* CIA. Do you have any doubt about that? Secondly, there is no way those men could have held out against Castro's million-man army, even if all ten of Castro's planes had been destroyed. Even if the Brigade planes had dominated the skies, it wouldn't have worked. There was no significant opposition to Castro within the country. The CIA simply lied through their teeth about that. The Cuban people would have stood virtually 100% behind Castro in his expulsion of the CIA invaders. And do you think other countries would have stood by and watched passively while CIA aircraft dropped bombs on the Cuban troops defending their own country? I suspect that if the OAS were likely to intervene at all, it would have been in that case on Castro's behalf, not the CIA's.

I said I wouldn't badger you, but I would still appreciate a response. Your position on these matters is no longer clear to me.

Congratulations, belatedly, on your 80th.

I keep thinking of your vision of "Chumpsky" up there on the roof about to push a car off the ledge onto your singing head. This is the hatred of those who cannot or will not sing for those who can and do. It's unfortunate that he doesn't try to get out a few notes himself. But then he would be "singing" on his friends. The poor chump.

Joe includes an appendix to McNamara's *In Retrospect* by James Galbraith which would serve, as Joe says, as a fitting appendix to my correspondence with Chomsky as well. It confirms that JFK had decided to withdraw from Vietnam. Galbraith does not address, however, Newman's attempt to exonerate the CIA and scapegoat the military.

Of the Chomsky correspondence, Joe writes (4/11/97):

After reading that I've totally lost any respect I had left for Chomsky. He never directly addressed any of Mike's points, repeating himself time after time. He couldn't even bring himself to acknowledge the simple fact that there was a policy change after the assassination. His insistence that Kennedy kept pressing the war against the wishes of

the Pentagon would be absolutely laughable if it were not so incredibly dishonest. To see the supposedly leading leftist intellectual of this country stoop to fabrication of evidence and finally sarcasm and personal ridicule is indeed astonishing. He'll go to any lengths to avoid taking the assassination seriously and is worthy, in my opinion, of our utmost contempt. If he had any integrity at all he could simply say, "Yes, it is obvious that the assassination was a high level CIA conspiracy, but I have chosen to focus my energy on fighting the CIA on other issues."

Ray Marcus writes (3/26/97):

...there is no symmetry to your [M and Chomsky's] respective positions. This is certainly not a case of honest intellectual differences between colleagues; you are clearly seeking to find and disseminate truth, and he is clearly trying to avoid and deny it. I found Chomsky's performing intellectual contortions ironically amusing–the leading intellectual of the western world has mastered the technique of protective stupidity.

I think Marty is correct in his assessment that Chomsky decided what course he was going to take on this soon after my contacts with him in 1969.

We all know the story of Ray's attempts to enlighten and engage Chomsky as well as other leading leftist intellectuals in the assassination, in the hope that they would see it as it should be seen, as part and parcel of the anti-war struggle, from Marty's book, as well as in Ray's own self-published *Addendum B*.

Vince writes (2/13/97):

I cannot believe that he [Chomsky] could have permitted himself to be so soundly beaten unless he was on an assignment to take you [M] on and instructed to stand and not to retreat from the assigned position.

Marty disagrees. He writes (2/14/97) that "Chomsky was not honestly discussing the issues but rather defending his ideologically driven position," which "is all determined by Chomsky's institutional alliances":

Bottom line for all these academics is to protect the integrity of the institutions which are feeding them. And since these institutions have no integrity in regard to a momentous political crime, these guys must lie about it. It is as simple as that, and you will never ever get anywhere with them.

But Marty pulls his punch:

Incidentally, I don't not accept Vince's idea that Chomsky is a paid conscious CIA agent, because I think it is unnecessary to the explanation of his actions and makes what Chomsky is doing less significant by separating it from academia's response in general. Chomsky is no different from any of them. He is just a little more out in the open on this issue, because he prides himself in being the radical opponent of the liberals and has taken it upon himself to tackle the so-called JFK "hagiographers."

For Marty, in short, Chomsky is a liar, but no different from other academics in ignoring the significance of the assassination. They are not lying to protect the CIA, but to protect their institutions.

Whoa. Just a minute here. Couple of things.

First of all, Chomsky is obviously *not* like most other academics, and he most certainly would not lie to protect MIT, academia in general (which he constantly attacks himself), or whatever it is Marty thinks is at stake here.

Secondly, there IS nothing at stake. Marty says that since their "institutions have no integrity in regard to a momentous political crime, these guys must lie about it." This

is not logical. Educational institutions are not supposed to take political positions, and don't, even when they should. But that doesn't mean the people who work in the institution "must lie about it." About what?

Marty's reason for claiming Chomsky's lying is "typical," and thus not significant, is that "institutions have no integrity." This is not a reason. It makes no sense. Why is Marty trying so hard not to attach any special significance to Chomsky's lying? For me, this is as important as the assassination itself–or even more so, in terms of how it has affected my view of the world.

First Marty says that discussion of the war is insignificant, as far as the assassination is concerned (*his* "false debate"), and now he says that Chomsky's lying about precisely this issue is also insignificant. Chomsky says the war had nothing to do with the assassination. Schotz says the war was only one of many factors in the assassination, and talking about it is counterproductive–a "diversion." Correct?

They are saying the same thing. Marty and Chomsky (and Gibson) are saying the same thing: "Forget the war–that is, forget the connection between the assassination and the war."

I have a hard time swallowing this. My main point of disagreement with Marty is also the main (and only) point of disagreement with Chomsky. This point Marty describes as a "diversion," but everyone so far who has read the Chomsky-Morrissey correspondence agrees that the leading intellectual dissident in the country and perhaps in the Western world, a highly respected scholar and acknowledged genius, is a liar. This point is the main message of the Stone film, unquestionably the most important message for anybody who lived through the Vietnam trauma, and the one issue that could still get people out on the streets if the truth were known. The (to me) astonishing discovery of Chomsky's dishonesty–an unprecedented discovery unless Chomsky has been shown to have lied about other things–occurred in the course of a discussion of this particular issue.

Vietnam is the common denominator here. Maybe Marty is just making a stupid mistake, which coincidentally turns out to be the same stupid mistake that Chomsky made, namely, failing to see the importance of the war to the assassination (and vice versa). It *is* just plain stupid to try to downplay the importance of an issue that directly involves the death and suffering of millions of people. It *is* just plain stupid to say that Noam Chomsky is a liar, and then say it doesn't matter because all academics lie.

Herewith an imagined dialogue:

"The warmongers did it," say Thomas, Prouty, Garrison, Stone (and Salandria?), and I.

"No, they didn't," says Chomsky.

"Well, they might have had something to do with it," says Gibson, but that wasn't the only or most important reason. No reason to get particularly excited about it."

"Absolutely right," agrees Schotz. "And furthermore, anybody who talks about Vietnam in relation to the assassination is actually participating in a false debate, in order to divert our attention away from the real significance of the assassination."

"What might that be?" I ask. "What is more significant than a ten-year war that cost (that is, earned for the warmongers) $570 billion and killed at least two million people?"

"Think about Cuba," says Schotz. "Think about McCloy-Zorin. Think about the Cold War."

"No," says Gibson, "think about how wonderful *all* of JFK's policies were, and what a wonderful world they would have created."

"But Vietnam is important for Chomsky," I protest. "His first book about the assassination is also about the war. That shows how important the connection of these two subjects is."

"No, it shows just the opposite," replies Schotz. "It's part of the diversion. Chomsky's part of it, Newman's part of it, Prouty's part of it, and you'll be part of it, too, if you keep talking about it. It's what they want us to think is important, but it isn't."

"But what about the fact that Chomsky lied?" I say. "As far as I know that's the first time ever. Why on this issue? Isn't that significant?"

"No," says Schotz. "All academics lie, in order to protect their institutional alliances."

"You think Chomsky would lie to protect MIT?" I ask. "From what? I think the fact that Chomsky is lying on this particular subject is very significant. He is not at all like most academics, and most academics are not liars. If the correspondence proves he is a liar, as you say it does, who else can you say this about? How many other scholars of his reputation can be exposed as liars? Can you show me any set of documents comparable to these letters that warrant a similar conclusion about anyone of Chomsky's stature and importance? I don't think so. Yet you say his lying is not significant because all academics do it. This is bullshit, Marty.

"Or is it even worse? Are you a spook? Have you (and Gibson) been assigned to the Salandria group as an arrière-arrière-arrière garde to stave off that final explosive connection? What? The warmongers did it? Murdered the president and took over the government like a banana republic? Killed, maimed and poisoned our own boys in a war for their own profit and nothing more? What would be left of the country if such a notion really took hold? Is that the bottom line for you, Marty, the way it apparently is for Chomsky? Is that why you don't want us to get too excited about Vietnam and the assassination, or about Chomsky's lying about Vietnam and the assassination? Is that why you developed a theory that anybody who does get excited about Vietnam and the assassination is distracting people from more important issues, like Cuba?"

"Not just Cuba," says Marty.

"Yes, I know," says M. "Think about McCloy-Zorin. Think about the Cold War."

"You got it," says Marty.

"And a bunch of other stuff!" says Don Gibson.

"Nah," says Prof. Chumpsky. "Don't think about any of it. The assassination has no political significance. Ahem. I mean, no *proven* political significance. If there *was* a policy reversal in Vietnam, then it would be legitimate to wonder about the assassination. Then the assassination would have political significance. I mean *possible* political significance. But there was no policy reversal. I prove this in my book beyond the shadow of a doubt. Morrissey accuses me of citing evidence to the contrary, namely that the CIA started to reverse their assessment of the war (from positive to negative) two days after the assassination, but he is an ignoramus who doesn't understand the meaning of words. He doesn't understand the difference between a *tactical* adjustment, which is

what happened after the assassination, and a *policy* change, which never occurred at all. How long did this guy say he has been living in Germany?"

Marty's not going to like this. He's going to think I am being over-zealous in defending Prouty, which is suspicious in itself. By challenging Marty, I invite a counterattack of the sort Michael Parenti fired off in response to his letter to Newman. I will become the suspected spook. That's ok. If anybody has any reasonable arguments, I will listen to them and try to answer them. Parenti never wrote back. Newman never wrote back. Chomsky degenerated into sarcasm. That's the real obstacle, where the dialogue stops, or never begins. Where there is no dialectic, there can be no growth.

Is this not the point of conversation? It is better this way, with everyone's doubts and suspicions on the table. The only way to have an open discussion is openly. The two issues I feel most strongly about are the connection between the war and the assassination, and Chomsky's lying in order to keep precisely that connection under cover. Marty opposes me on precisely these two issues.

Joe Stimmins tells in his letter of the antagonism he faces whenever he tries to talk sense to the vets, about the "wealthy elite power structure" and so on. I know exactly what you mean, Joe. I faced the same thing on an Internet mailing list I joined for a while called VWAR-L. I was honest, and most people were tolerant, and a few even supported me, but a larger minority (including the list owner) were rabidly hostile and drove me out after a few months. I imagine that's about the same constellation you would get anywhere. Unfortunately, the ones that support you will be reluctant to show it, because that will endanger their standing with the other vets, which is more important to them than their standing with you, even though they may agree with you.

On the whole I was quite discouraged by that experience, and it did a lot to disabuse me of a–there is no other word–romantic image of Viet vets as being all like Oliver Stone or John Thomas or Ron Kovics, underneath it all. I thought I could "save" them (and us) if I opened their eyes politically. I saw them all as the way I was, before November 1988. But I was a bit naive, and much too optimistic concerning my ability to take the abuse that I opened myself up to. Jeez, what a fool! Joins a list of Vietnam veterans and takes the nickname (Draft) Dodger! If it had been a bar I'd be lucky to have gotten out alive.

I admire your courage, Joe, in walking into that hornet's nest. Maybe it's different when you can meet them face to face. In any case I'm sure it takes more guts. All I know is it didn't work in cyberspace, and I won't do it again. I'm afraid my conclusion is that any Nam vet who is still a True Believer is most likely going to remain one for the rest of his life, and maybe it is better that way. I at least do not want to be the one to take away his last illusion. Nor do I want to open myself up again to the abuse that some are always too ready to dish out to people like us, though they would never dare to raise their voices against their lord and master, the US government. (Some defended the CIA, specifically.)

Something is wrong. I keep saying Vietnam, Vietnam, Vietnam, and other people keep saying, Forget it. Chomsky says it (I'm irrational), Marty says it (I'm "distracted"), and Don says it (I'm simplistic). What do you think? Do I belong in one of those hospitals myself? Or is it still the war, after 30 years? I think so. I should not be fighting with Marty over this. I should not have had to fight Chomsky over this. But that *is* what we are fighting about. It is the epicenter. First with McGeorge Bundy, then with Chomsky, and now with Marty.

Is it me, or is the war still raging? I would be interested to hear your thoughts on this, from the perspective of someone who has direct contact with many of the victims. I mean, it's not as if they were the victims of a flood, or an earthquake, is it?

VS (5/19/97)

…April 24, Reverend Joe Stimmins sends us Fred H. Leeman's admission to having framed Jim Garrison for NBC. Joe also forwards a May 12, 1968 speech by Jim at George Washington University. Jim, like Fletcher, states here that he doubts that the entire CIA was involved in the assassination. Well, to the extent that this suggests a spin-off of responsibility and a designation of some power or powers lesser than the national security state and below the military industrial complex and its civilian allies as responsible for the assassination, I would respectfully but emphatically disagree with my dear departed friend Jim Garrison and my present friend, Fletcher Prouty. Now, I am not saying that a spin-off, lower-level conspiracy is the conception of Fletcher. If it is not, Fletcher, let us hear from you on this score. But I am open to accepting the work of our Professor Don Gibson to the effect that the decision to kill Kennedy emanated from a power greater than the CIA, such as the Eastern Establishment Cold War elements. Although I am open to proof that powers higher than the CIA were involved in the decision to kill Kennedy, my mind is closed to any suggestion that Kennedy's assassination involved only rogue, spin-off or aberrant elements of the U.S. power structure. I am utterly convinced that the killing of Kennedy and its cover-up were the work of the true decision-makers, governmental and civilian, of the U.S. national security state apparatus.

…Joe is going to try to tackle Ruth Paine. Joe, that is a tough job. When I met with her and Michael Paine back in 1965, I strongly sensed two persons who were under tight control of the intelligence community. Michael Paine left me no doubt that he knew about me. He suggested that I should continue to work in the civil rights and civil liberties area and not waste my time on the JFK assassination. On that visit which I made with Shirley Martin, Ruth apparently got to Shirley Martin, who was an early and courageous critic. Shirley turned on me as we left the Paines and showed contempt for the whole critical effort. You can depend on the fact that the U.S. National Security State chose these two critical pieces in the assassination effort with the greatest of care. If you, Joe, have any success with Ruth, it will amaze me. I do think that she is important enough, if there is an indication of her revealing her true role, to have her killed. Because if you attach Ruth to the intelligence community then all of the Mafia and other false candidates are driven out of existence. The organization that controlled the Paines orchestrated the assassination. The Oswalds could not have gotten to the Dallas area in time for the killing of JFK without Ruth. Lee and Marina could not have been separated off during the crucial time prior to the killing of JFK without Ruth. Patsy Oswald could never have been positioned in the Texas Book Depository in time for the killing of JFK without Ruth. The "assassin's rifle" could not have been "stored" where it could have been attributed to Lee without Ruth and her garage being handy. Oswald would never have been without a lawyer while he was in custody except for Ruth fumbling after Communist Party U.S.A. John Abt and not getting a local civil liberties lawyer to represent him. No conspiracy with Oswald as the patsy would have been possible without the employment and control of Ruth Paine by the assassins. Therefore, to identify Ruth's bosses is to identify the assassins. Joe, the government chose the Paines very wisely. I am

most pessimistic about your likelihood of success. But the best of luck to you, Reverend Stimmins.

…From *Noam Chomsky: A Life of Dissent*, by Robert F. Barsky, p. 114, we learned what Prof. Chomsky thinks of us:

Chomsky employs this appeal to reason in probing two important issues; the relevance of the irrational and the role of the intellectual in society. To the irrational he consigns "fundamentalist religion; JFK conspiracy cults..."

Also of interest to me are pages 140 and 141, which tell us about Chomsky's position regarding his vigorous defense of Walt Rostow returning from governmental service as the quintessential hawk to be a professor at MIT. With an enemy such as Prof. Chomsky, Walt Rostow needs no friends….

VS (6/16/97)

Let me speak to my feelings about the reference to Fletcher Prouty which Marty made in his book, *History*, and which has caused so much consternation in our committee.

…In my judgment, Fletcher is not an intelligence agent…. I make this judgment based on the amount of good he has done in the assassination work. His emphasis on the invasion and military escalation of Vietnam by the U.S. as the major cause of the killing of Kennedy is in my judgment a defensible position and not one which the national security state is about to concede to us, Marty notwithstanding.

Marty agrees that U.S. policy re Vietnam under Kennedy just prior to the assassination was to withdraw. Marty agrees that this upset the U.S. military-intelligence community. Marty agrees that the Kennedy policy was changed immediately after the assassination. But Marty feels that it is senseless and counter-productive to be diverted from the plain fact that the evidence of the killing of Kennedy by the military-intelligence complex for Kennedy's efforts to mollify the Cold War is overwhelming.

Marty feels that no one could have predicted at the time of the Kennedy assassination what would have happened in Vietnam. I take issue with Marty on this. For two years prior to and up to the Kennedy assassination while I was teaching high school in a working-class neighborhood of Philadelphia I told the students to stay clear of the military because they were likely to die in Vietnam. I did not know, but I did believe from early on that that we were going to lose that war. I also recall, after the assassination, expecting the military escalation.

But, irrespective of my differences with Marty on this detail regarding Vietnam as the motive or one of the motives for the assassination, I feel very strongly that he has a right to raise the issue of the pseudo-debate over Vietnam. The issue of whether I, Fletcher, or any of us are agents is one that should be examinable. This issue should not consume much of our time, because it could distract us from the time we spend on our shared task. But I don't feel that apologies are owed if such a mistaken allegation is made against any of you or me. We should calmly speak to the issue and address it seriously. I see our common task as refining knowledge of the truth of the JFK assassination and determining what the truth has to instruct us about the history, if any, which resulted from that event. Further, our task is to employ our knowledge to inform us, where relevant, as to the nature of our present national security state and how it employs its immense power. I see us as undertaking through the exercise of free speech the task of seeking out the

truth of the subjects of our inquiry irrespective of the political consequences to the state and irrespective of the consequences to us as individuals.

Personally, I go about clerking with a feeling of love for you. I would again request of you that you seek to have your interpersonal interactions not fall below the level of civility. Mike Morrissey, on page 25 of *Notes from Ground Zero* rightly urges that with civility as our guiding mode of discourse our differences can be healthy and serve as a stimulus for growth."

What Morrissey does is direct us back to our task when he inquires of Fletcher that he explain his statement that "the CIA didn't do it." This is Michael pointing us in the direction of good work through good questions. This he does after defending Fletcher against Marty's implication. What better model for our behavior can we have than that...?

VS (10/28/97)

…[Pierre Salinger and I] had a phone conversation that lasted about 15 minutes [on Oct 26].

…He recommended to me a book by Ron Lewis entitled *Flashback: The Untold Story of Lee Harvey Oswald*. He advised that in this book Ron Lewis points up CIA connections of Oswald. I explained that I had spent time with Oswald's mother in her home. She was convinced much before the killing of Kennedy that her son was a U.S. intelligence agent. Although I did not mention this to Mr. Salinger, Marguerite Oswald told me at that time (summer of 1964) that after Oswald "defected" to the Soviet Union, she visited the State Department to inquire about her son. She was given red-carpet treatment and was reassured that she need not worry about her son. She concluded that Lee was on an intelligence assignment in the Soviet Union for the U.S. government.

I was my usual strident and overly zealous self with Mr. Salinger. I poured out at some length to this patient man why I thought that any explanation other than a National Security State assassination of President Kennedy to alter his course in seeking to mollify the Cold War was part of the pseudo-debate designed to mystify the killing and thereby prevent the recognition of the simple truth. I told him that the same CIA which had killed the President was now explaining to the American people that it had satellite photographs showing the TWA Flight 800 at the moment when it was breaking up. I told him that the CIA was reporting that the plane spewed burning gasoline earthward which was uniformly interpreted by some 200 independent eye witnesses as a missile rising to hit the plane. I stated that these CIA lies were similar to those which were being utilized to generate a phony debate over which of several false candidates had killed JFK. I stated that the CIA in its explanation of the TWA shoot-down was concealing the National Security State's guilt in having brought down the TWA Flight 800 with one of its errant missiles. He said that he agreed with me 100 per cent on that point.

My behavior towards Mr. Salinger is unforgivable and intolerable. He is a gracious truth-seeking man who is fully entitled to my deference. He sought to help me very early in providing a tape of the Situation Room tape on Nov. 22, 1963 to the Cabinet plane. He will not ever receive from me in the future anything other than the utmost respect and all the good manners I can muster and to which he is clearly entitled. He has been targeted by the mainstream American press for his efforts at bearing witness to the truth in the TWA tragedy. He deserves and will receive in the future all the courtesy of which this peasant is capable of expressing.

I have viewed a tape of William Pepper, the author of *Orders to Kill* and the attorney for James Earl Ray. This is unquestionably a fine man. But I worry about his approach to the truth, which leaves him vulnerable to being trapped into swallowing misinformation. We might be able to help him avoid some pitfalls. If Jim Douglass knows him, as I suspect he does, could you, Jim, bring him in as a recipient of the mailings? I feel that he might benefit from our approach. Even as fine a lawyer as Jim Garrison was made to swallow misinformation. These swallows leave us defenseless when we spit them up in public before the mainstream media, which are all too eager to publicize our ingestion and expectoration of misinformation. Pepper is too decent and valuable a person to be used up by the clever tactics of feeding lies to be accepted as truth to would-be truth tellers, and thereby discrediting them. Can we be of use to Pepper?

…Oct. 20, Joe Stimmins sends us a piece on Curtis Le May and JFK in the Cuban missile crisis. Le May acts as if he is the Commander-in-Chief and President Kennedy is some stupid, cowardly underling. Is that the way the founding fathers fashioned the Constitution, or is that an example of how the Constitution got rewritten during the course of the Cold War and how the growth of the National Security State rendered the military-intelligence arm as the true governmental mechanism of the American empire?

I offer some excerpts from *One Hell of a Gamble: Khrushchev, Castro and Kennedy*, 1958-1964, by Fursenko and Naftali (NY: W.W. Norton, 1997). The Kennedy family clearly knew that the killing of JFK was a foreign policy assassination designed to continue the Cold War unabated by JFK's concern about the continuation of our fragile planet as habitable for humankind….

VS (12/11/97)

…Nov. 9, the *New York Times* promotes Seymour M. Hersh's *The Dark Side of Camelot*. The importance of the JFK role in seeking to mollify the Cold War thereby necessitating his killing by the CIA is born out by the sustained effort to trash his memory through a series of national security state-sponsored media releases. Hersh's effort is but one of many. These persistent efforts convince me that if anything I have underrated JFK's significance in history.

…Dec. 6, 1997, the *NY Times* tells us that the national security state is going to get tough with independent investigators of Flight 800. We are lucky that the warfare state didn't decide to go after us with criminal processes on the JFK matter. With me they tried tax audits, a threat to kill, efforts to bribe, and loosening nuts on auto wheels. All kid stuff….

MM (12/31/97)

Many thanks for the latest packet and Ray Marcus's *#5 Man*. I'll go further than Jim DiEugenio: I think this image (which I had not seen either until I saw it in *Addendum B*) is the most powerful evidence of all, simply because it has a human face in it. That makes it much more powerful, psychologically, than any of the other evidence. This would explain why Ray hasn't found a commercial publisher.

Ray deserves our heartfelt thanks for providing us with the documentary record of his struggle. This will be of great value, once the truth is accepted, in demonstrating how one man (with the help of a few others, like you) fights not only officialdom, but an entire cultural mindset (of denial), over the course of three decades.

As you see, I'm an optimist. I do think the truth will out someday, even if not our lifetime. What the world will be like at that point I don't know. Maybe not very different at all. That's a frightening thought!

I'm sorry neither Marty nor Fletch felt inspired to answer my last letter. I would still like to know what they think.

I need to (very belatedly) thank both Ray and Fletch for sending me copies of a review of Chomsky's latest. But consider: nastiness is not dishonesty. If he's nasty (rude, inconsiderate, vulgar, snide, even cruel), so what? No one is greatly interested in his character per se. But if he is dishonest, it raises the question of why. That is the important question, not his character as such. That is why I consider your various independent judgments about my correspondence with him as so important: if Chomsky was being dishonest with me, as you all agree, why? I think this is the very heart of the matter. How do the bastards get people like Chomsky on their side? Or are they are not bastards at all, but good guys, as we used to think Chomsky was? Are they benevolent leaders, lying to us for our own good?

On the other hand, if he is not lying about the importance of the assassination (and the withdrawal issue), and is simply delusional, then it is still the heart of the matter, because the question then would still be why. How could such a smart guy be so stupid? (Same question I asked myself about McGeorge Bundy, until I saw the Turner film in Nov. 1988.) If we can understand how to make somebody like Noam Chomsky so stupid on one particular issue, we would be greatly enlightened indeed.

Bromberger's comment to Ray in 1969 that if "they" did what we think they did, they are "too powerful to confront directly" is worth some heavy cogitation.

1998

VS (1/14/98)

…Dec. 23, The *Philadelphia Inquirer* reports that new U.S. governmental releases demonstrate how JFK directed the Pentagon that "all planning will be directed towards preparing RVN (South Vietnamese) forces for the withdrawal of all U.S. special assistance units and personnel by the end of calendar year 1965" (an Oct. 4, 1963 memo from Maxwell Taylor, Chairman of the JCS). Other documents show that within a month after Kennedy's assassination, Johnnson told the Pentagon to plan for "increased activity" against North Vietnam. Still another document directed the military to consider in these activities the "plausibility of denial." This is an invitation to the Gulf of Tonkin fraud.

Dr. Michael Morrissey, would you write to Prof. Chomsky and ask him where he now stands on the position of JFK as indistinguishable from the other cold warriors who ran our government and whether there were any foreign policy changes that followed his killing? If he does not reverse course now, he must be fairly viewed as a witting agent of the national security state which has supplied his salary at M.I.T. Of course, Michael, if you so confront him, you are free to provide for Prof. Chomsky any of the comments I have made about him in our correspondence.

…Dec. 29, Rev. Joe Stimmins sends us a batch of valuable material. Theodore C. Sorensen's excerpts from *The Kennedy Tapes: Inside the White House During the Cuban Missile Crisis*, which appeared in the *Washington Monthly*, Nov. 1997, is beautifully

done. Almost without editorial comment he selects items from the tapes and shows the contempt in which the U.S. military held its Commander-in-Chief and his concern for the preservation of the planet. Fulbright's favoring of the invasion of Cuba during the missile crisis speaks to the almost total isolation of that brave man, JFK. Aside from RFK, Salinger, Sorensen, and Schlesinger, JFK stood alone against the greatest power in the history of the earth….

MM (2/5/98

I have been reading the so-called "Torbitt document" and wonder what you think of it.

I suppose the Internet is abuzz with interpretations of Hillary Clinton's reference to the "vast conspiracy" out to get her husband. I haven't been following it, but just according to what I've read in the *International Herald Tribune* and on CNN, I would speculate that the Netan-Yahoos, using the CIA (of course), were clubbing Clinton for being too friendly with Arafat. This Linda Tripp woman is clearly an intelligence agent. These same Yahoos probably killed Rabin for the same reason.

The saber-rattling with Saddam is probably connected, too. I wouldn't be surprised if both are simply diversions from what would otherwise be the obvious rift between Clinton and Yahoo, and the latter's clearly unreasonable policies. The IHT reported not a word of this possibility, but buried in one article was a reference to discussion taking place in the liberal Israeli press. Our press hardly ever tells us what reasonable Israelis are saying, which in turn tells us that the biggest Yahoos are in the US, not Israel.

As for Saddam, I am wondering how much discussion there has been in the US about this. There has been none here. No one asks what the strikes are supposed to accomplish, or why the US wants to drop more bombs on (possible) biochemical munitions factories, which is likely to release another wave of Gulf War Syndrome, now afflicting more than 10 thousand American veterans, as well as their spouses and children (since GWS appears to be contagious as well as inheritable). Not to mention the Iraqi victims, of course.

I think constantly, I am almost ashamed to say, about what sort of higher powers are driving these events, and part of that same thought is the knowledge, becoming more certain every day, that I will never know any more about it than I do right now. Then I keep thinking of that book *The End of History*, which I haven't read and don't intend to, but the title can be taken to mean something different than the author probably intended. I guess he was referring to the fall of the Soviet Union, but since I think that was a plot, too, my notion of the end of history is that the accumulation of lies has become so great that it (history) no longer exists, unless we redefine it as fiction.

I am fascinated by your story of rubbing elbows with someone related to Mafiosi who said JFK's "own people" did it. I would also like to know what rich people say about it, in private. You will resent being called rich, but you can't deny that you talk with a lot of people that I will never be able to talk to, at least not in a confidential way, simply because of the class difference ("class" meaning "net worth" in American English).

Does our predicament parallel anything in history? I can't think of anything. I think unnamable forces (beyond the CIA) orchestrated all of the 60s assassinations, all of the wars since 1945 (to some extent no doubt the World Wars, too), control the mass media, control the radical fringes, including the left, including Noam Chomsky, Norman

Mailer, Alex Cockburn, Rudolf Augstein, etc., and control the conduct of science where political issues are involved. I can add to this that the same forces created AIDS, killed Rabin, and brought out Monica Lewinsky the day after Clinton showed a halfway reasonable face to Yassir Arafat, but enough is enough.

This view of reality does not accord in a single instance, much less in all of them, with the views of any respected politician, government official, scientist, historian, journalist, scholar, intellectual, religious leader, or even artist that I know of, contemporary or historical. Somebody here is off his rocker. That's what it boils down to: us or them.

I'm glad I can say "us," and mean by it doctors and lawyers and professors and businessmen and such, because if I just meant a bunch of people on an Internet discussion group, it wouldn't mean anything. Then "we" would be crazy. We might as well be saying things are run from Mars. Even as it is, I suspect that a large percentage of psychiatrists and psychoanalysts, reading our correspondence, would pronounce us all seriously mentally ill.

Ray, thanks for that 1967 Garrison speech. I can't get over the fact that he was saying so much so early.

VS (2/13/98)

…Jan. 26, a considerable batch of material comes form Barbara LaMonica. Barbara, I don't feel that Kennedy was killed because he was too progressive on domestic matters. I recall that he proposed and got effectuated a regressive reduction of the progressive income tax at the upper level from the 90% rate to 72% and the lower rate from 20% to 14%. That meant that people like me took home 28 dollars instead of 10 for every $100 of adjusted income, almost a 300% increase in take-home pay. The poor guy like my father took home an extra six dollars for every $100 of adjusted income. That kind of "progressive" activity will not tend to get you killed by rich guys like me.

I enclose a speech I gave on June 9, 1968 in Central Park, NYC, which still represents my view of the motivation behind the assassination. You and I are in essential agreement but for a difference in focus. My conviction regarding the motivation for the public and gory firing of Kennedy has always been a Cold War, foreign policy one. The CIA, in my judgment, was the designated assassination agency which the National Security State would and did naturally avail itself of for the disposal problem. A disposal method was employed which would signal to those who were not in a state of denial that the killers were so highly placed that a political correction of the deed was not feasible.

But the 1934 aborted coup of FDR was different from the JFK killing. In 1934 we did not have an autonomous military-industrial-intelligence complex which was feeding off of trillions of dollars of taxpayer money. In 1934 rich bastards like me would have to enlist and buy our killers. But in the assassination of JFK the CIA computers were able to tap their data bases and spin off the perfect killers and the perfect patsy. The CIA used taxpayer money to do its work of selecting the operatives and paying for the Dealey Plaza show. In 1934 we did not have a Cold War complex that was unhappy with Roosevelt because of his accommodations with the Soviets.

Roosevelt was slightly shifting the distribution of wealth downward and charging the rich for some of the social welfare measures. That earned him the enmity of those less enlightened of the upper classes who could not recognize him as the savior of a capitalist system that was in its apparent death agonies. But in the killing of JFK, Martin Luther

King, Malcolm X, and Robert Kennedy, in my judgment the motivation for the killers was not an argument over the distribution of wealth.

Rather, in the killing of these four the central issue was that of peace or war and whether the military-industrial complex would be able to continue to use the Cold War as its reason for endlessly feeding on and expropriating the nation's wealth, to the detriment of our cities and our poor. That is what I believed when I finished reading the Warren Report and saw the violence that the U.S. government had done to its own evidence when it seized upon the U.S. intelligence patsy, Oswald, as the sole assassin. Only the CIA could have had the knowledge of and power over Oswald which permitted him to be framed and to have the killers protected by the U.S. power structure, which would involve itself in the criminal activity of being accessories after the fact. Barbara, you write and reason so well. It is such a pleasure to have you in the correspondence.

Barbara sends me her video tape "Welfare Warriors." It is a great job, and Prof. Chomsky does good work in his commentary. But the issue of the emasculation of welfare does not go to the question of the legitimacy of the state. It deals with the cruelty and class interests of the state which maintains at enormous cost war-readiness in the absence of a credible enemy. Prof. Chomsky is willing to speak out on such an issue but not on the destruction of the Republic.

…Jan. 30, Joan Mellen writes to Ralph Brown about Jim Garrison's gravestone, which bears the words "Let Justice be Done Though the Heavens Fall." I owe Jim Garrison a great deal. It was because he existed as the only public figure in the world willing to take on the CIA over its killing of JFK that he became the target of the falling heavens. Private truth-seeking citizens like me were largely ignored by the killers. I lost nothing in my pursuit of the truth. For his courageous efforts, Jim suffered greatly.

…Mike, the "Torbitt Document" is in my view disinformation. Why should we look to make out our case from a document without sources? Why should we depart from the evidence provided for us by the U.S. government in the Warren Report and its Hearing Transcripts and Exhibits? Why should we depart from the hard evidence of the holes in the shirt and suit jacket of JFK? Why should we turn from the evidence of CE 399, the magic bullet? Why should we retreat from the impact phenomenon of JFK's body being propelled leftward and backward by the force of a shot being delivered from his right front? Why should we not speak of the significance of *Life* magazine's three separate changes of a single issue in order to try to get the right caption to try to explain away from right front gunman? Why should we step back from the Warren Report and the choice of the National Security State to ignore the evidence in that report of a conspiracy? The Torbittt Document is another disinformation effort to make a mystery out of and cause us to rely on irresponsible sources rather than the government's own evidence of a clear-cut removal of our titular head of state by the real government, our National Security State.

I think that the Clinton business is another example of what Barbara LaMonica describes as the right against the middle in American politics. But American politics in my view is terribly circumscribed. The real issues confronting our world, militarism, terrible disparity of incomes between the rich and the poor, the ecological crimes and the depression of wages by the globalization of industry, racism, imperialism, hunger, the cybernetic revolution and its cheapening of the value of human labor, the market system's

creation of economic crises, etc.–all of these issues are not considered proper subjects for serious consideration in U.S. politics.

Clinton is a liar. But I don't feel that the American public has any right to inquire about his sexual addiction just so long as it does not impair his performance as the titular head of state. Tripp is a horrible Yahoo. But I don't feel that the CIA is paying her to do the dirty work which she has done. The Yahoos want Clinton out because he is not shoveling government revenues for the welfare of the rich at a fast enough pace. I don't think the National Security State has a serious beef with Clinton. He will allow the Pentagon to have its military hardware advertised to the world when it bombs the people of Iraq.

Rabin, I believe, was killed by an agent of Mossad in order to halt the peace process. Only a moderate such as Rabin could have engineered a successful peace process with the Arabs and not have incurred the wrath of the Israeli right wing. The killing of Rabin assured that Israel will remain a militarized state.

Mike, *The End of History* addresses the market as the defining accomplishment of humankind.

Mike, although I have married into a very wealthy family, none of our friends is rich. I have talked with very wealthy people. They have no interest whatever in the killing of JFK, Martin, Malcolm or Robert. They are in a state of denial. They don't want to feel that the wealth they have accumulated is in any manner connected with the militarization of the U.S. They tend to believe that the American military serves a useful and even humane purpose. They tend to believe that American foreign policy is aimed at spreading democracy and human rights. They support financially the American one-two party system and take an active interest in narrow issues with which the American politicians ply their trade. They refuse to look closely at the crimes committed by U.S. intelligence.

Mike, I don't think Monica Lewinsky was sent into Clinton by cynical forces. Clinton appears to be out of control sexually. Monica has not been his only target. But I do not feel that this is any of my business….

MM (3/12/98)

Thanks for allaying my suspicions that the rich know more than we do. I guess the equation Money = Power = Knowledge (at least of how power works) is too simplistic. I don't have a lot experience in this area.

I suspect that our political beliefs put us well outside what psychiatry and psychoanalysis can handle, just as a witch doctor would be hard put to judge the sanity of someone from a different tribe and culture. The point I was trying to make was that we are either right or wrong, that if we are wrong we are crazy, that if we are right we are healthy, and that if we are healthy, everybody else (who doesn't agree with us) is insane.

I'll give you a good example of denial. My wife and I were ascending an escalator in the lobby of the Peachtree Towers in Atlanta some years ago, and about halfway up to the next level I looked down and saw a black man, about 60, dressed in a tan suit, sitting on a sofa, sleeping, his mouth open, his fly open, and his penis standing straight up through it. (Unzipping your fly in your sleep seems like a pretty good trick, but obviously it can be done.) The strange thing was that sitting opposite him on another sofa, not more than a couple of yards away, was a white woman about the same age, also dressed quite properly, as you would expect in a fancy hotel lobby. She sat there calmly, with her

hands folded in her lap, looking around–probably for her husband–and somehow managing not to see that black penis waving in her face. I kept waiting for her to see it, because I couldn't believe she would just sit there like that if she did. But she didn't. She just kept scanning right past it. (Yes, she was wearing glasses.)

That is denial. Or you could call it sleep (in which case who was more deeply asleep, the woman or the man?). I would say the woman was insane. Just as insane as she would have been if she *had* seen the penis and it *wasn't* there.

We are black penises waving in the air, Vince. Or as Ralph Ellison called it, invisible.

I am relieved to see that you agree with me, Vince, that Rabin was executed by the Mossad. I had not actually heard anyone else but myself utter that thought. It's not hard to imagine that the same forces threw Monica Lewinsky at Clinton the day after he stood up to Mr. Yahoo. I did not get this from *The Spotlight*, by the way, or anybody else. It's only logical. (By the way, I have long since let my *Spotlight* subscription lapse, and am about to do the same with *The Nation*. The only journals I get now are CAQ and the daily IHT.)

The timing was the giveaway. It was quite transparent, really–like JFK. And Agent Tripp, of course, who has a tattoo on her left buttock saying "The truth shall set you free" in memory of the most ecstatic day of her life, when she was invited to Langley to suck the dick of the Deputy Director of Plans. I know because I have a tape recording of the whole thing. This woman is an agent as surely as Gerald Posner is.

I'm glad Barbara LaMonica made the parallel with Antonioni's *Blow Up* re Ray's No. 5 Man, because I thought the same thing. What could be more inherently cinematic? In the hands of a good director (not Oliver Stone!), something might be done–lots of zooming in and out and that sort of thing.

VS (3/18/98)

…I enclose my deceased father-in-law's subpoena to appear before the House Un-American Activities Committee. We have taken the original–which is truthfully in pink–and framed it for our library. It speaks to a period of his life when, although a very wealthy man who benefited much from the market society, he saw socialism as more fair than capitalism. At his 90th birthday party, before about 100 guests, he said that he wanted to continue to live in hopes of seeing a society where people contributed according to their ability and received according to their needs. For this belief he was deemed to be potentially un-American. With respect to the National Security State, I declare myself un-American. I resent the sparseness of my FBI and CIA files. My hope is that there are more weighty files secreted somewhere in the government's archives attesting to my earnest albeit ineffectual opposition to the National Security State. I am not modest enough to accept what appears to be a plain fact, i.e. unlike the attention it paid to my father-in-law, the U.S. government never viewed me as important enough to notice.

…[the recently released CIA Inspector General's report on the Bay of Pigs] seeks to explain the failure on the concept that the CIA made monumental and myriad blunders in effectuating the invasion. In *The Confessions of Allen Dulles*, we learn that Dulles knew that the invaders would probably get hung up on the beaches, knew that the invasion, per se, without the help of a U.S. military intervention, had no chance for success, and consciously chose to entrap Kennedy into a position wherein he would have

had to approve of a U.S. military operation against Cuba. I don't happen to believe Allen Dulles was stupid. I do happen to know that he was treasonous and did seek to withhold information from JFK which if it had been revealed might well have aborted the operation. I know that he withheld this information in order to have the anti-Castro brigade trapped on the beach so that the U.S. military would have to invade to save it. I view the newest release as being designed to sidestep the treasonous behavior of our military and intelligence betrayal of Kennedy in laying a Bay of Pigs trap for him into which he bravely chose not to step. I would hope that the future will produce a society that views an Allen Dulles as un-American.

…Mike, you are also the only person I ever heard other than myself state that the Mossad executed Rabin. How much evidence do we have? I only know that the assassin had intelligence training and experience; had a security agency card on him at the time of the killing so that he was able to mingle with (other) security agents "protecting" Rabin, and a security guard of Rabin rather than shouting alarm at the time of the shooting chose to declare the shots "Blanks, blanks." I only know what effect this killing had on the Israeli election which produced a right-wing government. I only know what happened to the peace process after Rabin's death. I am rather familiar with the lone-assassin scenario. I know what occurs in societies which become militarized. I know about black holes. I know enough! Mike, you and I are possibly the only ones publicly fingering the Mossad for this assassination. We may feel somewhat naked and alone. But just maybe the emperor wears no clothes….

MM (3/23/98)

Re Linda Tripp, I feel my suspicions confirmed when I read in *Newsweek*:

She was introduced to covert operations through a secretarial job at the U.S. Army Intelligence Command at Fort Meade, Md., in the mid-'80s. Following her husband, who would become a colonel, to Fort Bragg, N.C., she got a job with the top-secret commando unit, Delta Force, so secret she couldn't describe it on paper (3/21/98, p. 33).

"I've worked on the covert side of the Department of Defense for 15 years," she says. Then she says she's afraid for her physical safety, and that of her children. Do you think she's trying to tell us something? They had this woman primed and waiting to go, and the day after Clinton stood up to Yahoo, they send her in. We haven't heard a thing about the "peace process" since.

What is even more suspicious and disgusting is the behavior of the media. I've seen exactly one reference to a *possible* connection between Monica Lewinsky and the deadlock with Netan-Yahoo, buried deep in a *Herald Tribune* article, and that was merely to mention that this was being discussed in the *Israeli* press. But there hasn't been a single word about it in our press, German or American, that I've seen. Can it be that such an obvious question has not occurred to any of the hundreds of journalists feeding, and feeding on, this story? No, it cannot be. Ergo, a media conspiracy to avoid the question.

Then we have the former Secret Service agent testifying about the president's private life. I don't know what sort of oaths and security checks they have to go through, but I have no doubt that they would preclude this behavior if they were enforced. The same goes for Tripp. Ergo, they are not enforced. Ergo, the power to enforce them does not come from the president. Ergo, that power lies elsewhere. We have two "former" intelligence agents betraying the head of state in the most conspicuous and vulgar way.

How is it possible for such low-level players in the national security apparatus to flout the ostensible head of it? Only if he (Clinton) is *not* the head of it.

I think we have some more transparency here, Vince. I think we have, again, the hand of the bully saying "Ok, smart ass, take this!" Part of the transparency has to be that they want us to see them as they really are, just like the bully in the playground. They are not ashamed. They are tough as shit, and proud of it, and we better believe it–especially us smart ass college types. I think we recognize this mentality, don't we? One has a tendency to imagine that great power is somehow synonymous with intelligence (not in the CIA sense), but I think the actual events show that the great powers are much more concerned about convincing us of their brutishness than of their intelligence. I mean, do evil geniuses shoot people and make sex scandals? Perhaps, but we are wrong to imagine that because they are powerful enough to do these things that they are also geniuses, or in fact intelligent at all. If I may use the term Mafia in a general (non-Italian) sense, the dons don't have to be smart. They can buy all the smarts they need. And what I'm saying is, I think these people are constantly tempted to reveal themselves, just to show us! Hence the transparency. That bully, you know, who not only wants to be in control but wants to rub our insufficiently obeisant faces in it.

VS (4/30/98)

…March 31, Dr. Gary L. Aguilar offers me an invitation to speak and to be honored at the 35th anniversary conference of the Coalition on Political Assassinations in Dallas. I am not a member of the group. I debate long and hard about accepting any honor. I am most certainly entitled to none. Do I accept it in order to get substantial billing to articulate our viewpoint? Marty is invited to speak. So, I asked Dr. Aguilar in a phone conversation whether he would accept as a complete package, Jim Douglass as a speaker with Marty and me. He immediately agreed. I told Dr. Aguilar that if I should accept the invitation to speak, I would be speaking about the lack of mystery in the assassination. He said the content of my speech was up to me. I asked him how much time I had to make up my mind. He said I had as much time as I wanted. A more gracious invitation to a non-entity such as I is difficult to imagine.

…April 9, 1998, Rev. Joe Stimmins…sends a chapter from Jim Garrison's *Heritage of Stone* entitled "Power." Dr. Anita Schmuckler and Chris Kefalos of our group will remember working with me in doing clerical work on Jim's manuscript. When I was delivering the final galley proofs of the book to New York, driven in an automobile from Garrison's office by one of his staff members, we were treated to a little gamesmanship. On the New Jersey Turnpike we heard a recurring thumping coming from a wheel. We pulled over to find that all the lugs on one wheel had been loosened. Big Brother was just letting us know that he was watching us….

MM (5/20/98)

I'm not sure if congratulations are in order or not on your invitation from COPA. I guess so. Even though you know that half of them are agents, and the other half are conspiracy *theorists*–that is, people who believe there is something left to prove. What do you feel you can tell them? All of the energy they have invested is based on the assumption that you are wrong–that there is a real reason for their work. That's why they are in that organization, and it is why that organization exists. If they believe you, they will all pack their bags and go home.

The leadership is suspect. Is there any question in your mind that John Newman is a government agent? Do you think that someone who is to all appearances as wildly radical as John Judge could become the head of such an organization, if he really were what he appears to be? Do you think Newman would be on the board if he were *not* exactly what he appears to be?

And I'll go one step further: Do you think Michael Parenti could be who he appears to be and leap so stupidly to the defense of John Newman, as he did in his response to me, and then trip over himself trying to avoid any sort of dialogue afterwards with me or any other member of our group?

Do you really want to be honored by these people? This is like Jesus, if you'll pardon the comparison, getting an award from the Romans for his "significant early contribution" to Christianity.

Re the Bay of Pigs, frankly, I believe I settled the whole issue with my little article in *The Third Decade* and the COPA paper.

Vince, why don't you take Ray Marcus with you to COPA? That one picture, and the continuing story of the campaign to ignore it would be the perfect demonstration of whatever you are going to say. Ray's photo is something new, for most of us, I think.

I appreciate all the secondary material everybody sends along, Vince, but I wish more of the correspondents would say something about themselves and maybe even occasionally express an opinion or two, if that is not too radical and extravagant a suggestion. Isn't that the main purpose of this effort? You are the *only* person in the group who makes an consistent effort to respond to everyone. Everybody else just tunes in and out as they wish, and it's mostly out. This is wrong.

MM (5/30/98)

Unlike you, I have no objection to your accepting any honors. On the contrary. What I object to is that COPA, or many of the people running that show, don't deserve to do the honoring. I was disappointed and pissed off by the way they collectively, using Parenti, sloughed off my challenge to Newman, which I happen to think was important. (I sent copies of my letter to Newman to all the members of the governing board.) Furthermore, although I was told by several people that my talk was the best one they heard at that first COPA conference, it was never published (I don't know if any of the others were). All the talks were videotaped and I believe can still be ordered, but I doubt that many are.

Still, I agree with everything you say. How could I not? Of course it is a forum, and thus an opportunity to disseminate truth, even if every other person in the place is an agent. I would certainly have made the same decision you have.

VS (6/15/98)

May 1, Rev. Joe Stimmins…sends material from the *JFK Deep Politics Quarterly* on the identification of a TSBD shooter. Joe, this kind of article bores me. I think the group is beyond wanting to know what the mechanics might have been who fired the shots or were present in the "sniper's nest." The same goes for *Bloody Treason*. I bought the book, and felt the money could be better spent. Its purpose in my view is to narrow the responsibility for the assassination so as to spare from guilt the center of U.S. power. It offers us a consolation prize of a few more bad apples in order to spare from responsibility the whole of the U.S. military-intelligence and its civilian media and corporate allies….

VS (9/17/98)

…Aug. 19, Ralph writes to Ray Marcus and mentions the Clinton/Lewinsky matter. My sense is that none of this was our business because the affair was not a matter of state. I feel that Clinton's privacy rights were violated. His lawyers, in my judgment, erred egregiously in their tactics of having him agree to participate in this process, and to lie and seek to get out of his lying with legal trickery. I feel that we and other peoples are now further exposed to falling victim to Pentagon-generated incidents designed to expand their share of the national budget. I feel that the right wing in this country will seek to avail itself of a weakened president to shovel more tax-cut money at the rich of which I am one. In my judgment this character assassination of Clinton will serve to weaken further the prospects of any future presidents demonstrating the independence and integrity which JFK showed and for which he was assassinated….

MM (9/28/98)

The important point about "conspiracy theory" is that people reject the notion when it is applied to the government. The king has never had a problem ferreting out conspiracies, existent or non-existent, amongst his subjects. This is standard practice for getting rid of troublemakers.

When we try to talk about conspiracies by the king and his henchmen against his subjects, though, or by the government against the people, we are talking about the perfectly normal behavior of all governments. Every government is a conspiracy. Every government involves people planning, at least occasionally, to do bad or illegal things, so they are all guilty of conspiracy. Often.

On Monica and Bill, two things strike me. First, nobody seems to have noticed that this whole affair is parenthesized by the Arafat-Yahoo meetings. The day after the last one (in January), when Bill got tough with Yahoo, the Lewinsky thing broke. Now they're meeting again, with apparently more propitious prospects of success. Does the whipping Clinton has been taking have anything to do with the change of direction?

The most shocking thing about Clinton's grand jury testimony was his accusation that the prosecutor had used ILLEGAL MEANS (deliberate leaks) in a POLITICALLY MOTIVATED and KNOWINGLY BOGUS case, FUNDED BY UNNAMED PRIVATE SOURCES, in order to damage him politically. This is the president of the United States making this accusation, under oath! Not an offhand remark during an election campaign. Why is there no outcry from the press, demanding a full investigation? All this fuss over whether or not Bill understood fellatio as sexual relations, yet not a word, not a peep, not a snicker, not a single joke from Jay Leno, not even the briefest acknowledgement, anywhere, of what is in fact an explosive accusation.

What we are really seeing here is another assassination. Murder and pornography are standard weapons for the CIA, and if we were to pause for half a second to think about it, which is more important, the meaning of the words "sexual relations" or the fact, at least the fact as stated by our head of state, that a political witch hunt is taking place, which is in fact a kind of assassination?

Look for an important policy change in the coming weeks–like the reversal of the withdrawal policy in Vietnam after Dallas. In fact it's about withdrawal here, too (from the West Bank). Maybe there's something about withdrawal per se, a sexually rooted thing, that brings out the low blows.

What kind of enemy are we looking at here? Are we looking at an Evander Holyfield or a Mike Tyson? They don't like you, dey blow yer head off, or rip your clothes off and expose your sexual sins. Whose modus operandi is this? The Mafia? Sure. And what government agency uses the same methods? Remember Sukarno. What government agency has in fact worked with the Mafia on a number of occasions, and with similar criminal elements all over the globe? We are not dealing with gentlemen.

I predict a major concession to Mr. Yahoo, maybe next week, like coming down from the pre-Lewinsky figure of 13% land concession to the Palestinians.

Nerve gas in Vietnam: This is another astounding and classic case of media corruption. I've read the articles and also read the "independent" counselor's report, and the true situation is NOT that the report was wrong, but that the case is less than 100% convincing. In other words, it is (still) most likely TRUE. What the media have managed to do is distract us from that fact, that the story is probably true, by making a tremendous issue of the fact that it is not as absolutely certainly true as the initial report may have implied. This is how you move people from thinking "X (a very bad thing) happened" or even "X may have happened," both of which might rouse people to action, to "It is not 100% sure that X happened," which has a paralyzing effect.

VS (10/27/98)

…Oct. 10, *NY Times* full-page ad asking for an end to the cover-up regarding the shoot-down of TWA flight 800. Be informed that Commander William S. Donaldson, USN (Ret.), who did the work, has publicly committed himself to an international terrorist missile attack as the cause of the crash. The fact that the military are so predominant in this group causes me to question whether a fallback position is not being prepared to protect the U.S. military, whose careless missile-firing caused the crash.

…Enclosed is a draft of my speech to be given in Dallas. If you want to help, your *negative* criticisms will be much appreciated….

MM (10/31/98)

The speech (received today) is great. I mean truly great, a historical landmark. You will be speaking for me, and I am proud to be mentioned in the speech as a friend.

I would like to ask you to consider adding the following paragraphs on p. 24, just before the one beginning "We now...":

President Kennedy was killed because he had decided to withdraw from Vietnam, a decision that was reversed within days after his death. This fact has been obscured, and continues to be obscured, or disguised, by a false debate about what Kennedy would or would not have done in Vietnam had he lived.

This debate is false because regardless of what he would or would not have done, the fact is that what he *did* do was order the beginning of a withdrawal of all US personnel that would be completed in two years. Instead of that, in two days, two days after he was killed, the CIA produced "radically revised assessments of the military situation, which canceled the assumptions on which the withdrawal plans had been conditioned."

I am quoting from *Rethinking Camelot*, by Noam Chomsky. Chomsky is a participant in the false debate, arguing with people like John Newman about what JFK *really* knew and thought before he was killed and what he *would have done* if he hadn't been killed.

But we know for a fact that the withdrawal policy was reversed, went from withdrawal to escalation, beginning just two days after the assassination.

Chomsky is well aware of this fact. I have just quoted his own words confirming this fact. Why does a man like Noam Chomsky, so astute in other matters, ignore the significance of this fact? Why does he then argue, in the most convoluted manner, that the real facts are that there was no withdrawal policy at all, and that therefore there could have been no reversal of it, and that therefore there was no radical policy change at all after the assassination, and therefore no connection between the guns in Dallas and the guns in Vietnam?

At this point you can refer to my homepage if you like: www.mdmorrissey.info. You can refer to me as someone who carried on an extensive correspondence with Chomsky on this point, and that the letters speak for themselves. Suffice it to say that at the end of this correspondence I was not rethinking Camelot but was certainly rethinking Chomsky.

I'm wondering why you left out this important point on Vietnam. Was it perchance Marty Schotz's influence? Marty got the whole idea of the false debate wrong, and it is important. It is not false or misleading or distracting to talk about Vietnam as a factor in the assassination. The false debate is speculating about unknowable things Kennedy *might* have thought or done. That is what Newman and Chomsky were bickering about.

The real debate is the debate I tried to have with Chomsky. This debate most certainly was, and is, about Vietnam, and most certainly is important.

I wish you resounding success at the COPA conference, and if you will, please picture me standing with your other friends at the end applauding.

MM (11/13/98)

Please omit the reference to me on page 25. I have no plans for any "future writings" on Vietnam and JFK. Nor do I want the CIA laboring under that suspicion.

The additions you made in the speech are good, but I'm surprised at your use of the word "agnostic" in relation to Chomsky. I'm also surprised that you omitted reference to the 58,000 American dead, in addition to the millions of Vietnamese.

VS (11/30/98)

…Enclosed please find the final version of my speech and Marty's which were delivered in Dallas. The talks were well received except for a discordant comment from Tink Thompson to the effect that Marty "is nuts." To which comment I pleaded guilty to being nuts. We went over on Nov. 21 to the dinner of the Lancer people where Gaeton Fonzi was the keynote speaker. Marty and I were scheduled to speak after Gaeton. After hearing Gaeton we determined that there was nothing more to say. There wasn't. So I advised the audience accordingly. Gaeton was remarkably eloquent. It would take even bigger fools than Marty and me to follow that Gaeton guy….

MM (12/3/98)

Congratulations on your success in Dallas, Vince, and if you feel honored, I think you deserve it.

I would be very surprised, though, if "our ideas," that is, what you said in the speech, "are now the predominant if not the exclusive model of explanation of the assassination," even among the non-agent researchers. I will be looking for signs of this. I

heard a lot of praise, too, after my COPA speech, and not a word of criticism. That may mean people approve of you, but not necessarily that they agree with you.

This segues into your question about disbanding the group. I would hate to see that happen. Didn't Joe Stimmins offer to take over as clerk? But I think the best thing would be to take it on line. All we need to do is exchange e-mail addresses. It's a relatively simple matter to set your mail program to send out multiple copies of your letter, and you can hear from others the same way. This is much cheaper and faster than by snail mail, and now you can even send scanned material, so we could continue to exchange documents, too. Nobody has to be clerk.

Perhaps you could suggest this in your next packet, and then the next time distribute the collected addresses, for those who want to continue.

The quality of the correspondence will decrease if this happens, but it's better than disbanding completely. I think we are important as a group. Where else can you go to discuss "our ideas" without creating a stampede of people trying to get out of hearing distance? Now that we have found each other–and you get the credit for that–I think we should stick together.

Why? Because what this is all about, now, for me, has little to do with "solving" the assassination. Like you, I think I've solved it. But the solution is "closure" only in the sense of a brick wall that we now feel our heads against. To use the language of my own transparency theory, we know they've got us by the balls. The question is, What now? Isn't that what our group is all about–a bunch of people asking themselves and each other that question? Isn't that the reason you started it in the first place?

What interests me now, having solved the assassination, is the psychology of it all, including that of people like us, in fact especially that of people like us. Why am I interested in this? Curiosity, I would say. The idea of actually doing anything to affect real life is an ever-dwindling source of inspiration. But the curiosity is still there. I have always been a curious person, and I guess that's just an inborn trait.

So that is my case for keeping up the group–if not through you then by e-mail. But if we are going to break up I wish you would pass on a last request–that everyone, including those who have never contributed, make some sort of statement about "our ideas" (as expressed in your speech or elsewhere). I am not even sure–not at all sure, in fact–to what extent we share these ideas within our little group, much less within the larger group of "non-agent researchers." It would be a shame if not even this can be established.

It's ok with me to keep this back channel. Back channel is better than no channel. And since we're already using the terminology, we might as well go online. I vote for that.

1999

VS (2/9/99)

…Feb. 5, I decide to bother Prof. Noam Chomsky. His letter of Dec. 7, 1998 is not enclosed, because he asks me not to circulate his correspondence. Shall we make a pool on when I will receive an answer from him? Marty Schotz's guess is sometime after

eternity. I do not envy him for the corner into which he has painted himself on the subject of JFK and his assassination….

VS (3/29/99)

…Jan. 31, Marty Schotz sends us Fidel Castro's thoughts on globalization, with which I totally agree. I consider Castro a great educator and humanitarian. That should certainly anger the majority of you. But I am constrained to offer the simple truth on my feelings about Castro. With respect to globalization I feel that it is the most important development of our century. In my opinion, unless transnational democratic forces evolve to control this development that humankind will as a consequence of it experience a grim period of ever-increasing misery followed by economic collapse. I feel that the collapse will result from the inability of lower-paid workers to buy a cybernetically produced ever-increasing supply of commodities.

…Feb. 16, Prof. Noam Chomsky comments on my COPA talk. He is, of course, not convinced by it. However, he calls it a "lucid presentation." As the world's leading linguist, aside perhaps from our Mike Morrissey, he knows that "lucid" is defined by *Webster's Deluxe Unabridged Dictionary*, Second Edition, as "1. Shining; bright; resplendent, 2. Clear, transparent, 3. Sane, mentally sound, 4. (a) clear; distinct; presenting a clear view, easily understood..."

But, notwithstanding that for him the talk was clear and distinct and easily understood, he held to his views, which are contrary to ours. The basis for his disagreeing with our viewpoint he has never bothered to set forth in any detail. I am leaving this man to his own needs on this matter. He is doing excellent work in other areas, e.g. globalization. This correspondence began, as some of you will remember, in an effort to turn him around on the JFK killing. Prof. Chomsky will not be turned. We failed. But at least he will not in the future be readily inclined to characterize our position as irrational. I was tempted to send him, but of course resisted doing so, Reverend Sidney Smith's comment to Lord John Russell:

You say you are not convinced by my pamphlet. I am afraid that I am a very arrogant person, but I do assure you that in the fondest moments of self-conceit, the idea of convincing a Russell that he was wrong never came across my mind. Euclid would have had a bad chance with you if you had happened to have formed an opinion that the interior angles of a triangle were not equal to two right angles. The more poor Euclid demonstrated, the more you would not have been convinced.

Instead of sending the above to him, on 2/23/99 I obsequiously write to Prof. Noam Chomsky and bid him goodbye, making an effort to have this sage in the future express himself not at all or with less hostility to our point of view.

…Feb. 20, The *Philadelphia Inquirer*, A3: "DNA Tests Considered in Search for Answers in JFK Killing." If and when the U.S. government wants to explore a limited hangout of its killing of JFK, it will perhaps use DNA as the means of explaining to the public why it came to reverse its original findings of a single assassin. It will perhaps explain that it learned the truth of a multiple assassin killing by employing technology which was not available to it at the time of the assassination.

Of course, this effort to characterize our government as merely mistaken in the Warren Report, and not deliberately concealing a state crime, is nonsense. The holes in JFK's garments were proof positive that the U.S. government was the killer. To arrive at that truth on the day of the assassination, nothing more had to be known other than the

location of the holes in Kennedy's jacket and coat. When the government which had that evidence immediately turned away from the multiple assassin conclusion to which it was necessarily driven by the location of those holes, without keeping its options open, it was identifying itself, for any disinterested analyst of the data, as the only plausible killer.

…[Re the discussion in the March/April *Probe*] In my judgment the key to the killers of Martin Luther King lies in the false passports which Ray possessed. This speaks clearly to U.S. intelligence connections….

VS (4/30/99)

…April 16, Rev. Joe Stimmins will be the clerk during July and August while I enjoy my privileged vacation…. I propose that any of you who would like to assume the responsibility of serving as clerk for this correspondence on a rotating or more permanent basis, please write to inform me of your proposals. How feasible would be converting this exchange to e-mail? Needless to say, I will happily assume all costs of this correspondence as my personal obligation.

April 21, I write to Dawn Meredith… [about] Fletcher Prouty's view of the CIA and its role in our society. I know that I have already explained, Fletcher, that I vigorously disagree with you on this subject. As an enforcement arm of our military intelligence complex, I feel that the CIA has played a major role in setting policy for the American empire which included the dispatching of President Kennedy. Fletcher, I would say that this disagreement is most certainly the major point of difference which I, and I fell the rest of the correspondents, have with you. Have you reconsidered your view?

Fletcher, allow me to have you consider this quote from Willie Morris's *New York Days* (Little, Brown and Co.), excerpts from which are attached. The author talks about a series of interviews of Allen Dulles:

In one such talk in the lordly vicinity around Dumbarton Oaks he [Allen Dulles] stunned me with an abrupt comment. "That little Kennedy," he said, "...he thought he was a god." Even now these words leap out at me, the only strident ones I would hear from my unlikely collaborator.

Marty Schotz, say what you will about him, is a fine psychiatrist. When I read that to him he said:

That's important. All of what we say about someone else is ultimately a projection of how we feel about a side of ourselves. So, Dulles felt he was a little god and that Kennedy fired God.

Let's not accept psychiatric evidence. Let's deal with a small portion of the legal evidence. Some of it follows:

Dulles had betrayed JFK in the Bay of Pigs by wrongly advising him about the nature of the invasion point and its unsuitability for guerrilla fighting in the event of the failure of the enterprise. He betrayed Kennedy in advising that there was a probability for success of the enterprise when the CIA knew that the invading brigade could not succeed, and in fact the ultimate invasion by U.S. forces was contemplated by the CIA without apprising Kennedy of this aspect of the plan.

Kennedy fired Dulles for his betrayal.

Dulles hated Kennedy.

Dulles retained many friends in the CIA who would perforce have shared his view of the titular president.

The patsy in the JFK killing was CIA.

Only the CIA could have manipulated its own person to serve the patsy role.

Since the CIA was the leading killing force of governmental leaders around the world, it would have to be considered a prime suspect in the killing.

Dulles, who had a hatred of Kennedy, and who had love for the CIA, did not see a conflict of interest in his joining the Warren Commission.

In his service as a Warren Commissioner he suborned Marina Oswald to perjury.

Need I go on? Fletcher, will you reconsider?

…For me [the Columbine shootings in] Colorado and Kosovo are tragic but mere small pieces in our culture of violence. Our society is permeated with and is driven by violence. It has a violent foreign policy, a violent war machine, a violent criminal justice system capped by capital punishment, a passion for violent sports, entertainment media which steep themselves in selling violence, and a commitment to promote and to extend globally a violent market system.

How many families has globalization destroyed? It strips away living-wage jobs and replaces them with starvation wages. It employs child laborers in industrially underdeveloped countries who work away their youths through long hours of labor in sweat shops which destroy them and their environment?

I for one distrust any solutions to the horrors of ethnic cleansing which rely on military threats and military action. I do not trust a UN military force, because the U.S. currently has a terrible grip on the UN. I do not trust any military action, because the U.S., as the single super-power in international affairs, commands most of the military might.

The solutions to nationalistic efforts to cleanse high schools, nation states and our world I believe must evolve out of non-violent action. Strategies of non-violent action must be developed which should have as their aim the freeing of all of humanity from the brutality produced by patriotic zeal. Only by freeing ourselves from the patriotic commitment to have our nation and our people excel in power and wealth over other nations and other peoples can we hope to end the wars which are facilitated by primary allegiance to nation states.

To achieve a peaceful world I believe that we must free ourselves as individuals and as citizens of the United States of our sense of entitlement to the profits derived from the brutality of global profit-driven markets. For a peaceful world I believe we must turn to the task of meeting the desperate needs of all of humankind with the same determination that we employ as we struggle to meet the needs of our immediate families.

I believe that we cannot expect our immediate families to be free of domestic and international terror directed against us until we warm to the task of meeting our responsibilities to the human family. I believe that non-violent action strategies must be adopted and acted upon which have as their purpose the ultimate elimination of economic exploitation, which impoverishes most of humankind while making some of us obscenely rich and privileged. We must become willing to free ourselves from our sense of entitlement to the privileges of economic empire. I believe that this empire which causes us to be privileged causes others to be poor. Until we address the needs of humanity, I believe we will be the targets of the terror which our refusal to accept responsibility for the impoverished human condition invites.

You will no doubt ask, is this at all probable in our lifetime? My answer is of course not! You will ask, is this not against the very nature of man? I answer that I very strongly doubt it. I feel deeply that humans were made to live in peace with human kind, and that in order to survive we must live in peace with one another. For those of you who believe that humanity's nature compels us towards war, I urge you that notwithstanding your belief, we must all join together and start working towards these healing goals. Because, given the nature of our weapons systems, should we continue on our violent course, sour planet will probably become uninhabitable for our species. Because, by starting in small ways to opt against violence and to opt for non-violence, we will take tiny steps on a path towards a peaceful planet more likely to be passed on intact and able to sustain our children.

Again, for those of us who posit that human nature impels us towards war, I urge that we all must explore the possibility that despite our genetic programming, as thinking and feeling beings, we can transcend our natural bent and learn new paths towards peace which will save us from our predisposition to war and to the consequent self-destruction of our human family. Still again, to those who are convinced that violence against our fellow humans is an essential aspect of our nature, I would urge that even if it were the case, in the interests of our children and of the human family we must all join together to conduct a noble experiment. This experiment is to determine whether through love, compassion and thought we can teach one another to control that dark side of human nature which threatens to destroy us all and threatens to lay waste to our lovely planet. My conviction is that if we undertake this odyssey we well discover in our journey the beauty of our true nature, our decency, our peacefulness, our rationality and our enormous capacity to love one another.

VS (6/8/99)

…May 18, Ray sends me our Jim DiEugenio's May 26, 1996 interview with Robert K. Tanenbaum. Page 14 of the interview tells us that Tanenbaum is full of it. You will see there, inter alia, that Senator Schweiker told Tanenbaum that

he thought the CIA was responsible for the assassination... I was very, I was stunned... I was stunned, I mean, I myself, even after investigating this case, am not going to say that the CIA did it. He was coming out definitively saying it. What the evidence suggested when we were in Washington was that there were certain rogue elements who were involved with Bishop and others, the Plumber types in the Nixon White House, who were involved with Oswald, who were substantially involved with anti-Castro Cubans. Who, that is, that the evidence suggests, were involved in the assassination...

The evidence suggests, in fact conclusively requires, the finding that Tanenbaum is doing the work of the killers. He is telling us that the evidence tends to demonstrate that the killing of JFK had and has no historical significance, and does not speak to the corruption and malevolence of the U.S. warfare state and its civilian allies.

…June 4, The *Philadelphia Inquirer*, June 4, 1999, prints an Associated Press article reporting that Senator Arlen Specter has been talking with Castro about "the Warren Commission's investigation of the assassination of President John F. Kennedy." That is ominous. Here again, no doubt, we have the Tanenbaum rogue element scenario being tried out on Fidel Castro. I am sure that tempting sweeteners for relations with Cuba go along with the discussion.

The Assassination Records Review Board offerings speak to the House Select Committee's preliminary interviews with Rankin and Katzenbach. Rankin was, and Katzenbach continues to be, a criminal. They obstructed and Katzenbach continues today to obstruct justice of a murder which has no statute of limitations. For details see my Dallas speech.

…June 8, I wrote to Professor Noam Chomsky and compliment him on a fine article….

MM (6/24/99)

It all boils down to trust, I think. Trust and perceived or suspected betrayal. Is Chomsky a friend or an enemy? Is it possible for someone like him to be somewhere in between?

The line has been held. We've had the Stone film vs. the media and Chomsky. If it had been the Stone film and Chomsky against the media, that might have been a real breakthrough. As it is, Stone and the rest of us have been marginalized, even demonized, and the Brave New World Order continues evolving apace. The "wild men in the wings" (Chomsky et al.) are still in the wings. Not in the streets. That's what our rulers dread– millions pouring into the streets. As it is, all they've got to deal with is a few pockets of crazies by the side of the road ranting about various conspiracies by various evil forces. That's nothing.

Re Chomsky's comment on the speech, "lucid" is better than "irrational," which was his adjective of choice in referring to me, but it just means clear. He thinks you are clearly wrong. Clear, but wrong. There is no contradiction.

I'm sure that his writings on globalization are informative, but I don't feel inclined to read them.

VS (8/9/99)

After extensive inner struggle, I have decided that my clerking days are over. I cannot see how I can continue to pay for the mailings without being responsible at law as the principal and therefore responsible for what goes out in our committee of correspondence. I worry about libel cases. The ones I chose to invite, I am willing to accept. But for those that may be generated against me, without my having control over them, I have no stomach.

All of my expectations in clerking for you have been exceeded. Several years ago I asked a number of my friends to provide some rationale that could be offered to Professor Noam Chomsky to persuade him that his public view that the thesis that the killing of JFK was a high-level U.S. National Security State crime was irrational was wrong. I expected the correspondence to be brief.

Professor Chomsky dismissed us very early by stating that he was unconvinced by our writings. But the correspondence continued nonetheless. As a consequence of the exchange of ideas, I soon recognized that this group was made up of highly sophisticated thinkers in the area of our concern. I learned much from your reasoning, research and proffered reading material. Because of our exchanges my thinking on the subject of our joint interest improved. For your help in sharpening my thinking, I am most indebted to all of you.

…John Kelin is putting together a very limited edition of all of my articles and speeches on the Kennedy assassination. It will be out later this fall. John, please, at my expense, send a copy to each of our committee members. Each of you will be able to see

from this compilation that all I have done in this area is to enumerate self-evident facts and extracted therefrom what I view as simple and necessary inferences. I have exercised no brain power in developing my understanding of the meaning of the killing of President Kennedy. I am not entitled to any credit for this work….

At this point the e-mail *phase of our correspondence begins. --MDM*

MM (9/14/99)

I am interested to hear that it was Chomsky who started you on the correspondence, Vince. I guess I didn't get that because I wasn't involved from the beginning. I don't think I ever asked. If it is indeed Chomsky who not only brought you and me together, but all of us in the correspondence, it makes again the point I tried–unsuccessfully–to make with Marty: Chomsky is important. He is not just another academic.

I once wrote to Chomsky that the issue is whether the government is so corrupt that it can murder even the president and then keep it secret. He replied (7/1/92) that this "would be an interesting question if there were any reason to believe that it happened." However, he sees "no credible evidence for that belief."

I think an equally important question is whether Chomsky is part of the conspiracy. Is there any "credible evidence for that belief"? I'm afraid there is: his letters to me. What do you think, at this point?

The alternative is that he is just another mind-blind intellectual, but that contradicts so much of the rest of my impression of the man that I cannot accept it. Furthermore, that hypothesis assumes that it is pure coincidence that he looms so large in both your and my (and probably in a lot of people's) experience in pursuing the JFK question, and of course also pure coincidence that except for this one issue, you and I agree with virtually everything he says.

I realize I'll never know for sure, but the preponderance of evidence seems to point to the first conclusion–that he is part of the conspiracy (that is, the secret government's secret plan to keep us in line). That makes it an interesting question, and leads to the further interesting question of his motivation. Among the possibilities there is that it is his own well-intentioned decision. That would mean there is a huge gap between the way he and I perceive the world, which would have to be accounted for somehow. What does he know (and won't tell us) that we don't, etc.

VS (9/21/99**:**

I agree with you. Chomsky has considerable importance. He turned off many who would have otherwise have been interested in the significance of the assassination.

His response to my speech, I feel, demonstrates a change in his thinking. If he can describe my presentation as "lucid," then he can no longer fairly state that there is "no credible evidence" that the government killed JFK. In my speech, I presented a lot of evidence for that point of view. Whereas before he called such a point of view "irrational," he described my speech as a "lucid presentation."

If he were part of a conspiracy, he would have done with my speech what has been done so effectively with all of my work. He would have totally ignored my request that he offer me "only negative criticisms." By replying that the presentation was "lucid," was he not conceding that he had no negative criticism? I did not offer, and he did not ask, that his comment be kept in confidence.

Having read my speech, he knew or had reason to know that I would consider maintaining such a confidence as bordering on criminal obstruction of justice. Therefore, Mike, you can feel free to speak out on his comment to you and to me. You can identify him and me. You can fairly announce that Professor Chomsky has changed his point of view on this matter. In my judgment he should not be berated for so doing, but rather should be praised.

MM (9/24/99)

Maybe we should think of ourselves as a support group. That sounds like we have some horrible rare disease, but in a way we do–if the disease being the truth. The question now is how to cope with it.

MM (9/26/99)

What has the group accomplished so far? Quite a bit, I think. We share a certain view of the world. That is a valuable commodity. Where else can I go and talk about the stuff we talk about and expect to be understood, or even tolerated? How long would I have to search the conspiracy websites and newsgroups before I found one or two other people with whom I could communicate at the level of mutual understanding that I think we have reached? A long time, I think.

MM (9/28/99)

I hope you are right about Chomsky, and I certainly understand your desire for some sort of closure on the subject. I'm afraid you cannot rightly conclude merely from his use of the word "lucid," though, that he now considers our point of view rational. "Lucid" is a change from "irrational," but it does not mean "rational." My dictionary defines "lucid" as "clearly expressed, easy to understand," and that is not the same as "rational."

The fact that he offers no counterarguments doesn't mean much either. He didn't really argue with me either, as you recall. It was not a dialogue. He did not respond to my arguments. He simply chose parts of what I said to re-launch his own arguments. The fact that he is apparently just writing you short notes means, no doubt, that he is tired of the subject. He figures he has said everything he has to say on the subject. Yes, your argument is "lucid," that is, it logical if you accept certain premises, like the fact that Oswald didn't act alone, that it was a government conspiracy, and that it was a high-level government conspiracy. But I'm sure he will say if you press him that he doesn't accept any of these premises, because he sees no credible evidence that they correspond with reality. So your argument is lucid, clear and easy to understand, but still completely without any factual basis. He hasn't changed his mind a whit. He's just hoping you'll get off his back.

If he had changed his mind, even just a little bit, why wouldn't he say so?

In short, I think you're engaging in a bit of wishful thinking there, Vince. It's an understandable wish, but what is the point in nurturing it if it is fantasy?

The story has not yet been told of what happened to Ellen Ray and Bill Schaap's obvious dilemma: on the one hand backing Stone and Garrison, and on the other hand courting Chomsky. There must have been a clash. I wonder what kind of relationship they have.

You say, Vince, that if Chomsky were part of the conspiracy, he would ignore us. That's what I thought, too, when I was corresponding with him. But let's not sell ourselves short. We are a serious challenge to him. I doubt that he is getting many such

challenges from the left. Maybe more from the right, but these he would feel free to ignore completely. The minimal attention he has given to us is warranted, especially if he is part of it.

John, your reference to me as a "tough hombre" warms the cockles of my macho instinks. I'm not, of course, though I do confess to a certain degree of stubbornness. I also probably have a bit more time to worry about these things than people like yourself, with a business to run.

You put it very well. We do owe something. Now that we have arrived at a certain state of semi-enlightenment, as I think we will all agree that we have, through the work that we have put into talking to each other, we should not give up but continue. It is not easy to know what to do. But we should continue discussing precisely that. I feel exactly as you do. I know of no one else, other than my wife, who is sick to death of the subject, I can talk with about these matters without having to go back to square one. We don't agree with each other on everything, but we understand each other. Where else can we go and say "After the coup..." and expect people to know what we're talking about, much less agree with us?

I think that we are treading a fine line between paranoia and denial: For most people, we are paranoid; for us, most people are in denial. That doesn't give us a lot of room to move, in terms of interacting with other people, so it is important that, having found each other, thanks to Vince, we stick together. We have to go beyond the political dead end that we all see (Chomsky is pretty pessimistic, too, by the way).

Isn't this pretty much where you were when you started this, Vince? You are kind to say we have helped you, but I venture to say that perhaps we have helped you most by understanding you. The same goes for all of us, I think. Compare that to the degree of understanding we have achieved with Chomsky (none, in my opinion). WE are the (largely your) accomplishment. Chomsky is important, but we are more important. Let us continue in that spirit. Leaderless, clerkless, anarchic (Chomsky would like that), but, I am still convinced, the vanguard.

VS (9/28/99)

I know that you are a linguist, Mike, and I am a lawyer who plays with words. But I can read my dictionary. The *Webster's Encyclopedic Unabridged Dictionary of the English Language* defines *lucid* as: "1. easily understood, completely intelligible or comprehensible; a lucid explanation. 2. characterized by clear perception or understanding; rational or sane...Syn. 1. plain, understandable, evident, obvious, 2. sound, reasonable..."

Your dictionary does not consider this the same as rational, but mine does. When combined with my instruction that Professor Chomsky offer only "negative criticisms," how can you say that he can now say he sees no credible evidence that my premises correspond to reality when he had an instruction to say that, if he believed it, and did not? He may not know that he has changed his mind, but he damned well has.

MM (9/29/99)

Vince, you've got me on that. Ok, "lucid" can mean "rational." I should have checked a bigger dictionary.

Still, what you say can be considered lucid, or rational in the sense of lucid, but untrue. That's what I meant, and it holds as much for "rational" as for "lucid." Given your premises, that there is credible evidence that Oswald did not act alone, that there was a

government conspiracy, and that it was a high-level government conspiracy, your argument is lucid and rational.

I'm surprised that Chomsky was so polite to you, after the rudeness he showed me, but that's all it is. Your injunction to offer only negative criticism probably enticed him to do the opposite–I suspect with a condescending smirk. If that is all it costs him to get rid of you–just to say your presentation was "lucid"–it's cheap.

I don't think any of us are playing with words. Words are important. They are all we have to work with. What do you think my correspondence with Chomsky was all about? But I'll tell you what the difference is. We are working. Chomsky is playing. He is the one who wants to say a withdrawal plan is not a withdrawal plan, that a change of policy is not a change of policy, that the assumption (of military success) is the same as the "condition of victory," and so on. I'm sure he is not above throwing you a peanut ("lucid") if he has a certain amount of respect for you and wants to get rid of you. He could say the same thing about any (in his opinion) outlandishly untrue, unfounded argument that is, nevertheless, lucid, logical, rational, coherent, etc.

As I said, I hope you're right, but I doubt it very much. It would be big news. Very big news. You throw a monkey wrench in with it, though, when you say "He may not know that he has changed his mind, but he damned well has." If he doesn't know it, he won't admit it, so we'll never know.

I know what you mean. You mean he may have admitted something inadvertently that reveals that he has doubts and suspicions (that we are right and he is wrong), even if he will never admit to it again or acknowledge it as an admission. I think it's unhealthy to entertain such possibilities. That's the way to the nuthouse. Anything is possible. We're trying to figure out what is more likely (to be true).

Most likely to be true, in my opinion, is that he hasn't changed his mind at all. But it is absurd for us to continue arguing about this, when it should not be too difficult to ask him to be more explicit. Does he now agree that it is "rational" to believe (conclude from the existing evidence) that the assassination of JFK was a high-level US government conspiracy? If he does not mean that, then I am right and he just meant in telling you your speech was "lucid" that it was clear–but based on false assumptions.

I don't think I'm the one to press him on this question, since we're referring to a letter he wrote to you. Why don't you ask him what he meant by "lucid"–if he meant that your speech was lucid and "rational" in the sense that it is rational to conclude what you have concluded from the existing evidence.

There is no reason why this should remain a mystery, but I have a feeling that it will. Have I become too cynical? We'll see. I predict he will ignore any further queries on the subject, and that you will be left with your hopeful interpretation of "lucid." That of course will be another victory for Big Brother, the Uncertainty Principle being his best weapon. No one knows that better than you and the rest of us "assassination researchers." If this principle is successfully applied to Chomsky, he will succeed in opposing us and (implicitly) agreeing with us at the same time. In other words, no one will ever know what he "really" thinks, just as no one will ever know what JFK "really" thought about continuing the war in Vietnam (because he did make contradictory statements).

Somehow, in Big Brother's universe, these little nebula of uncertainty are crucial points of power, I suspect. Paradoxically, in their vagueness, they hold things together, by

being flexible. They offer different points of attachment, different handholds, different strokes for different folks. Just like politicians.

I don't think we should make it easy for them and let it happen with Chomsky. If you write to him and want to include this letter, you have my permission.

VS (9/29/99)

I told Chomsky that I am not going to discuss this matter with him anymore. I mean to keep my promise. It does not appear to me that there is any mystery on how he feels. On November 23, 1998, I sent him my speech with the following letter:

Dear Professor Chomsky:

To my complete surprise the enclosed speech which was delivered by me was followed by a standing ovation. There was no negative criticism from anyone. I have that kind of perverse nature that only benefits from negative criticism. Could you find time to provide some?

Respectfully yours,

Vince Salandria

He replied as follows:

February 16, 1999

Dear Vince,

Thanks for the material and enclosures, which I've just read. I'm puzzled by your request for my "analysis of the...material." It's a lucid presentation of the conclusions that you and others have reached but as an attorney, you know that there's no way to analyze that. On my views on the evidence available, and the significance of the issue, you already know.

Sincerely,

Noam Chomsky

My speech was not without very substantial evidence of a national security state dispatching of JFK. Chomsky was invited to attack that evidence, and the conclusions I drew from the evidence. When he called the speech lucid, he was dealing with not only the premises and the conclusions but the evidence. The "presentation" was the whole speech, the sum of its parts. He did not offer any negative criticism of the premises, conclusions nor evidence. Therefore, when he called the speech a "lucid presentation" whether he meant to do so or not, he declared the "presentation" and therefore all that it contained as rational. Prior thereto he was telling you that it was irrational to conclude that the assassination was a high-level conspiracy with national security implications.

Sure, he says that he maintained his conclusions. And he said that he was puzzled by my request for his "analysis of the ...material." He said there was "no way to analyze that." Now, Chomsky knows that if he wishes to hold to his original position, he must have some basis for doing this. He now concedes that our position is rational. He offers no defense for why he feels that he can maintain his former position of no high-level conspiracy. He offers no evidence in support of his former position. He fails to come up with one criticism of the evidence on which we rely and the conclusions we derive from this evidence. He fails to come up with one error in our process of fleshing out the evidence or one error in our reasoning.

He fails to tell us how he arrived at his conclusions which are contrary to ours. Indeed, he argued that there's no way to analyze the material, and if such is the case, then there is no way of his arriving at contrary conclusions.

In short, Chomsky is in an indefensible position. On cross-examination any semi-competent lawyer would made hash of him. So, I submit that he has changed his position, and he does not know it. Or another way to put it, is that he has no position contrary to ours which he dares to set forth and seeks to defend. Or in short, he is naked.

VS (9/30/99)

Have you seen the recent *Probe* article (Sept.-Oct. 1999, John Newman,"Oswald, the CIA and Mexico City: Fingerprints of Conspiracy,")? What do you make of it? Am I wrong to be deeply disturbed by its conclusion:

From the foregoing it seems that Peter Scott's phase-one phase-two analysis is reasonable. In the early going after JFK's murder, the Cuban-Kremlin backed plot and concerns–-if only fleeting–about an upcoming World War III, precipitated a lone-nut official explanation to bury the whole affair. In other words, the world's most powerful law enforcement and intelligence agencies were prevented from doing their jobs, and were instead prodded into a massive cover-up. Given the punishment being doled out by Hoover at the FBI, it is no surprise that there was no chorus demanding a real investigation. Instead, there were only excuses explaining why it was all right to have done nothing.

The question which remains is this: did the plotters understand this before the fact? Did they manipulate Oswald and, perhaps, intelligence operations, to keep the virus dormant until the shots rang out in Dealey Plaza?

Concern about upcoming World War III crippled the intelligence agencies? But the CIA killed Kennedy? They were not covering up their own coup, but rather were protecting the world against World War III, which was shoved into the post-assassination events by the some clever plotters who had manipulated the CIA?

Given the punishment being doled out by Hoover at the FBI, it is no surprise that there was no chorus demanding a real investigation.

Only the fear of mighty Hoover caused the CIA, Congress, the President, the Chief Justice, all of the U.S. media, and the American Establishment to forego investigating the killing of JFK.

Finally, Newman says:

The question which remains is this: did the plotters understand this before the fact? Did they manipulate Oswald and, perhaps, intelligence operations, to keep the virus dormant until the shots rang out in Dealey Plaza?

So we see that Newman asks us to believe the plotter manipulated our intelligence operations, and therefore our intelligence agencies were not the plotters who killed Kennedy but were the victims of the plotters.

What do you make of this article? Has anyone asked Newman who he thinks killed Kennedy? Am I wrong in being deeply disturbed by this article?

MM (10/1/99)

I agree that Chomsky is in an indefensible position. That's what I was trying to tell him when he said there was no withdrawal plan, that it was not reversed by Johnson within days of the assassination, and that therefore there was no reason to suspect a connection between the two events–since one of them didn't take place!

That's why he became hysterical with me and lapsed into name-calling and pretending he was fed up with the whole subject. His argument collapsed. He could not

pursue it because he had no more ammunition (and didn't have much in the first place). It's the same with your speech. Only in this case he has much less to say.

Why does a man like Chomsky choose to maintain an indefensible position?

Because if he did not, virtually the entire "radical left" who are in his camp would be with us. *CovertAction Quarterly* would be with us. Ellen Ray and Bill Schaap would be (back) with us. ZNet and *Z* magazine would be with us. Howard Zinn, Edward Herman, and scores of other people would be with us. That is the answer, Ralph, why "Fuck him" is the wrong attitude. He is important. Vince and I agree on that. Don't forget that Vince started this correspondence because of Chomsky. He brought me into it because of Chomsky. Chomsky not only represents an important mind set, but leads it.

Ask 1,000 "radicals" if they know Chomsky's view on the assassination and the "supposed" reversal of the Vietnam policy. Many of them will, and many or most will agree. Ask the same group how many know Salandria's view on the assassination, or Morrissey's view on Chomsky's view of the withdrawal plan. Not a one will have even heard of Salandria, much less Morrissey. My correspondence with him has never seen the light of day, except within this group.

Vince, Chomsky does have a position contrary to ours. He has set it forth, in *Rethinking Camelot* and elsewhere, including his letter to you. But you're right, it is clear that he chooses not to defend it in detail. He did attempt to defend it in his letters to me, and you saw the result. After reading the correspondence, you wrote to me (2/13/97):

I cannot believe that he could have permitted himself to be so soundly beaten unless he was on an assignment to take you on and instructed to stand and not to retreat from the assigned position.

Now, because he said your presentation of your conclusions was "lucid," you want to assume that he has changed his mind and now agrees with you (us) that it is "rational" to conclude from the evidence that the assassination was a high-level government conspiracy, even though he says in the same breath that his "views on the evidence available, and the significance of the issue" are well known.

This is irrational. Your argument for believing it, for coming to this conclusion on the basis of the evidence (Chomsky's letter), is, as I said, understandable, and I might even say "lucid," but it is not rational. It is wishful thinking.

However, we end up in the same place, after all. You believe Chomsky now believes our conclusions are rational. Haven't you always believed that? If he is an agent, as you obviously suspected when you wrote that reaction to my correspondence with him, then of course he believes, and knows, that our conclusions are perfectly rational. He knows that they are correct. He has known all along. It is as rational as concluding on the basis of the evidence that one's nose is in the middle of one's face. It is the truth, and he knows it. But if he is an agent, it is his job to obscure or disguise that truth.

So, if you want to say that Chomsky secretly knows that we are right, though I would not conclude that from his letter to you, I will not disagree. It is what I suspect too.

I could never understand how a smart guy like McGeorge Bundy could conclude on the basis of the evidence available that Ho Chi Minh was going to rape our grandmothers if we didn't protect South Vietnam, even at the cost of thousands of American lives.

I cannot understand how a smart guy like Noam Chomsky can conclude on the basis of the evidence available that there was no high-level conspiracy to kill JFK, or that LBJ did not reverse JFK's withdrawal plan after the assassination.

Do you see the analogy? What is the answer to my problem with Bundy? I think we agree on that. He was on the other side. He was part of the conspiracy. He had a different agenda, dictated by Big Brother. All of a sudden, the mystery disappears. Bundy is no longer a problem. He is the enemy.

Likewise, Chomsky is only a problem as long as we are not sure whether he is a friend or an enemy. For me, that problem remains. I am not sure. I can only say that as a result of my correspondence with him, on the basis of that evidence, and *Rethinking Camelot* (where he admits what I tried in vain to get him to admit–that at the very least, there was a reversal of the evaluation of the military situation after the assassination)–on the basis of that documentary evidence, my conclusion, like yours, was that he is an agent.

We know, since at least Carroll Quigley–whose admirer Bill Clinton made it to the White House–that Big Brother infiltrates the left assiduously, including the radical left (even communists, as Quigley's supporter/detractor Cleon Skousen argues in *The Naked Capitalist*), so why not the linguistics department at MIT?

He has been successful. No one (on the left) dares question his logic, or his motives. I have heard that myself often enough. Philip Agee told me in Hamburg: "Chomsky? Whatever he writes, you can rely on it. He's the best."

Let's put it this way, Vince, I don't think you've discovered a change in his (public) position, but you may have detected a chink in his lie.

What to do. We might consider a full-court press. He has (rather, his people have) this website at www.zmag.org (ZNet), where he even has a chatbox (forum) where you can supposedly reach him. If they started receiving letters from a bunch of us, he might be drawn into a discussion. That's what we want, isn't it? I don't think it's what he wants, but in a public forum, we might have a chance. Take a look at the website, and see what you think of this as a strategy.

On the other hand, if there is no enthusiasm for this, I understand. I am not enthused myself. I don't think it would be successful. He won't say anything different from what he has already. For me, he remains a part, a big part, of the ongoing problem. That problem is 1) recognizing the enemy, and 2) coping with him. I say coping instead of fighting, because that may be all we can expect at this point, as John said. I don't think we should entertain any illusory hopes of revolution or "restoring" democracy (not that we ever had it), either.

Chomsky remains part of the problem, but we don't need him to confirm our rationality. I found this out the hard way, by slugging it out with him. He demonstrated to me, letter by letter, that he was less rational than I was. Much less rational. It took me a long time to accept this, because I simply could not believe that the Noam Chomsky whose books I had read was behaving in this way. But I had to believe it, because it happened. I had the letters to prove it. I showed them to you and the others, and your reactions to them seemed to be the same as mine, so that further confirmed my (our) rationality.

MM (10/1/99)

Vince, Ralph is right, Newman is part of the smokescreen. What is there to be disturbed about? You knew this, I thought, at the latest when I told you, right after the first COPA conference, that he had practically announced his true identity during the discussion session, when he said he was quite sure his research on Oswald would show that he was part of a renegade faction of the CIA, but that the CIA as an institution was not behind the assassination. There is no way that he could know this without having been told by someone he trusts absolutely, and we know who that probably was, don't we? The man came directly from NSA, for crissake.

This, by the way, is exactly the position of the staff of *CovertAction Quarterly*, or at least was a few years ago when I got a letter saying that from Bill Vornberger (no longer with them). This is Phase 3: Renegade agents did it. Phase 2 was the Mafia (not quite gone). Phase 1 was Oswald. Phase 4 is the truth. That will come when nobody cares anymore–perhaps sooner than we think.

I hate to bring it up again, but have you forgotten what I was trying to describe as the False Debate? I used the term quite differently than Marty did. The false debate is (was) not "Vietnam." The false debate was Chomsky vs. Newman: Did JFK "really" want to withdraw or not, and would he have? That question was, and is, false. It is false because 1) it is unanswerable, and 2) because the relevant question is not what he really wanted to do or would have done, but what he DID. He did issue NSAM 263, it was a specific withdrawal policy, and it was reversed by Johnson, if not with NSAM 273, as some argue, then by March 1964 at the latest. That is, I say he did. Chomsky says he didn't: there was no withdrawal policy, and no reversal of it.

This was the real debate, the debate that mattered. Chomsky and I had it, in the letters. I have the letters. You have the letters. If the world knew what we know–how he argued in those letters–they would realize, too, that the important question is not what Kennedy would have done in Vietnam but what he DID do–precisely the question that Chomsky and I were arguing about. Not the question Newman and Chomsky were arguing about.

I don't think anybody really understood me on this before except John. Do you understand me now?

VS (10/1/99)

Mike, in answer to your e-mail re Chomsky, I agree that he is important. I am absolutely convinced that he will never come over to our side publicly. I am also convinced that he privately put himself in an untenable position. But "irrational" does not equal "rational." Before he referred to our position as "irrational." Now privately he concedes its "rational." That represents a change, albeit private and not public.

Chomsky demonstrated remarkable ignorance in his correspondence with me regarding the JFK data. He does not know how to defend himself in this area. He does not want to defend himself. When confronted on the subject, he resorts to flight. For reasons which I cannot know he will not join us. But if he says one more word on this subject publicly that attacks our position as irrational, I will endeavor to answer him wherever and anywhere I will have access to a soap box. In the interim, if you want to take him on, that is your right. Feel free to use anything that I have written and anything I have said about him.

In answer to your e-mail on Newman: I understand.

MM (10/1/99)

I would like to call your attention to my contention, in *Looking for the Enemy*, that AIDS was devastating the Asian-African (non-white) populations of the world, and rather precisely in those areas (developing countries) where Kissinger, McNamara et al. saw the population explosion as a national security threat to the US (Kissinger, 1974) and the most serious threat to mankind after thermonuclear war (McNamara, 1979).

The following is from Reuters and AFP, reprinted in the *International Herald Tribune* (9/13/99:4):

Half of all newborn babies in Africa carry the HIV virus, the top United Nations campaigner against AIDS said Sunday..." It has "cut life expectancy by as much as 25 years in some African communities...More than 80 percent of the total AIDS deaths in the world have occurred in Africa. The 21 countries with the highest HIV prevalence in the world are all on the African continent, and in at least 10 of them, the rate exceeds 10 percent of the population. Meanwhile, life expectancy in most affected countries in Africa is declining, a reversal of the rapid progress made in the years that followed independence in the majority of the countries.

These statements were made in Zambia at the 11th International Conference on the Prevention of AIDS and other Sexually Transmitted Diseases.

The second watermelon, as Vince once put it.

There is a loose association of people around Dr. Alan Cantwell who share the strong suspicion that the US created AIDS, perhaps on purpose, as Jakob Segal and Robert Strecker, most prominently, have maintained. A man named Boyd Graves (a lawyer, Annapolis graduate, black, gay, HIV positive) has sued the US government on those grounds–and has lost, of course. Dr. Leonard Horowitz is also among this group (*Emerging Viruses*), but I haven't had any direct contact with him. Here are the addresses, in case anybody is interested: AlanRCan@aol.com, bgra365527@aol.com (Graves), tetra@tetrahedron.org (Horowitz).

VS (10/1/99)

From John Newman, *Oswald and the CIA*:

The CIA was far more interested in Oswald than they have ever admitted to publicly. At some time before the Kennedy assassination, the Cuban affairs office at the CIA developed a keen operational interest in him. Oswald's visit to Mexico City may have had some connection to the CIA or FBI. It appears that the Mexico City station wrapped its own operation around Oswald's consular visits there. Whether or not Oswald understood what was going on is less clear than the probability that something operational was happening in conjunction with his visit.

While we are unclear on the precise reasons for the CIA's pre-assassination withholding of information on Oswald, we have yet to find documentary evidence for an institutional plot in the CIA to murder the president. The facts do not compel such a conclusion. If there had been such a plot, many of the documents we are reading–such as the CIA cables to Mexico City, the FBI,. State, and Navy–would never have been created. However, the facts may well fit into other scenarios, such as the "renegade faction" hypothesis. Oswald appears–from the perspective of a potential conspirator with access–to have been a tempting target for involvement because of the sensitivity of his files. It is prudent to remember when speculating about where the argument goes from here that the government and the Review Board have yet to deliver what the Records Act promised: full disclosure.

On the other hand, we can finally say with some authority that the CIA was spawning a web of deception about Oswald weeks before the president's murder, a fact that may have directly contributed to the outcome in Dallas.

Is it possible that when Oswald turned up with a rifle on the president's motorcade route, the CIA found itself living in an unthinkable nightmare of its making? (p. 430).

…Many of the political and social issues that have emerged from the history of the Kennedy assassination as a conspiracy "case" will find their resolution in years to come, when less will be at stake and American academe can discuss them safely... At the heart of this situation is a relatively new development in American history; the emergency of enormously powerful national intelligence agencies (pp. 432-433).

The CIA did not employ Oswald? The CIA just developed an interest in Oswald immediately before the assassination and did not employ him as a "defector" to Soviet Russia? The CIA had an operational interest in Oswald? Was he not their designated patsy? Is it "unclear" what the precise reasons were for the CIA to withhold information about Oswald? Wasn't he their patsy?

Newman laments the lack of "documentary evidence for an institutional plot in the CIA to murder the president." Does he expect that the CIA left a paper trail on the assassination? He shows immediately that such an idea is ridiculous:

If there had been such a plot, many of the documents we are reading–such as the CIA cables to Mexico City, he FBI, State and Navy–would never had been created.

If they would never have been created, then why would Newman expect that an institutional plot by the CIA to kill President Kennedy would be detailed in documentary evidence?

Newman feels that the "facts may well fit into other scenarios, such as the 'renegade faction hypothesis.'" My speech presents many facts which do not fit into any "renegade faction hypothesis," but which fit into and only into a high level military-intelligence coup.

Why does the Review Board not deliver "full disclosure," if we are dealing with only a renegade plot?

Newman can say "with some authority that the CIA was spawning a web of deception about Oswald weeks before the president's murder," yet that does not indicate to him evidence of an institutional plot?

Then he says that when "Oswald turned up with a rifle on the president's motorcade route, the CIA found itself living in an unthinkable nightmare of its own making." Oswald had a rifle on the motorcade route? Oswald fired on the President? The killing of the President was a "nightmare" for the CIA, which opposed him on the Bay of Pigs, the Missile Crisis, the Test Ban Treaty, the withdrawal from Vietnam?

Some tell us the issues will have to be resolved when academe can discuss them safely. When I spoke on the conspiracy at Haverford college, I was introduced by an academic who said the people could know nothing until academia explored the assassination.

Look at the holes in the President's coat and shirt and you know everything there is to know.

The intelligence agencies are "enormously powerful" and yet in the *Probe* article and in Newman's book we are told by Newman to believe that they were manipulated by some low-level renegades.

MM (10/4/99)

I checked out the ZNet site yesterday–hadn't for a while–and I see they've changed the format a bit, and I don't know if it is still possible to have a public discussion with Chomsky. They seem to be committed to that idea, though, so we should continue to check it out and make our move (whatever that turns out to be–we should discuss it) when the opportunity arises. Howard Zinn is apparently plugged into that site, too, and Michael Albert is another anti-conspiracy nut, so I guess we can take on any or all of them for the purpose of public debate. The problem is, of course, that none of them are going to want to debate, so the task will be how to lure them into responding.

This is a rather interesting little exercise in itself, don't you think? Here we have this extra-progressive, open, blah-blah website just (seemingly) crying out for "Interaction" and open debate, and yet what are we going to have to do to make that happen? We should document our attempts, so that afterwards we can point to the history of frustration and say yeah, so this is what you guys call openness and free discussion. Won't be much of a compensation, but maybe better than nothing.

Vince, thanks for hunting out those Newman quotes. That is exactly what he said at the first COPA meeting, as I said: No evidence of an institutional conspiracy. His argument seems to be–if you can call it one–that because there WERE a couple of suspect documents, that is evidence of no high-level conspiracy, since a high-level conspiracy would presumably have left no paper trail at all. This is nonsense, any way you look at it. As we know and I think could easily prove, the "paper trail" is long, meandering, and designed to lead everywhere and nowhere. Chomsky's "argument" is the opposite: No conspiracy because no paper trail. Both are nonsense.

Look at the picture: An Army major walks directly out of NSA and pretends to join the "radicals" who are fighting the cover-up. He becomes an instant expert on JFK and Vietnam. (Prouty told us that when Newman interviewed him he hadn't even heard of NSAM 263.) This guy's book then supposedly becomes the scholarly basis for the Stone film (actually, I don't think anything significant from the book is in the film). We note in passing–and as I told him in my public letter to him and COPA–that even in this first book, the CIA is exonerated from responsibility for pursuing the war; the scapegoats are Gen. Harkins and lower-level military functionaries. The problem was "renegade military."

In his next book, this time much more explicitly, as your quotes show, he exonerates the CIA from any blame in the assassination, blaming it on suspected "rogue" agents.

Can there be any doubt where this guy is coming from, and where he is going?

You remember my letter to him. Why didn't he answer? That is suspicious enough. If he was honest, he had an obligation to answer. All the questions that I asked were courteous, and not at all inappropriate and should not have been unexpected, given his background.

Not only that. Why was he able to impress everyone at COPA so much, including Michael Parenti? I don't like to let such suspicions get out of control, but it was strange. Parenti defends him without so much as having read his book, and says I have no right to ask such questions. I should not ask if an Army major from NSA has taken any National Security oaths, and if that would prevent him from telling the truth if he knew it? This

came from Michael Parenti, mind you, a supposed leftist radical. I am supposed to trust Parenti after that? He never answered my reply to him, nor did anyone else.

Vince, if Chomsky secretly agrees with us now, or even concedes that we are "rational"–which I don't believe he does but you do–he is much more of a slime bag than he would be if he were just deluded. You say: "For reasons which I cannot know he will not join us." But why are you being so tolerant? He is not tolerating us. He not only will not join us, he is fighting us. Not with rational arguments and debate, but with insults and summary dismissals.

I ask you, what reasons could he possibly have to be so unreasonable, and so dishonest?

VS (10/6/99)

I do understand how rightfully angry some of you are with Chomsky. His position on the JFK assassination is patently wrong. His refusal to examine the evidence is infuriating. His treatment of us as imbeciles is unkind. But, nonetheless, I cannot join with you in your "full-court press" on Chomsky.

It appears that you are eager to involve yourselves in a debate on the assassination. I have never debated publicly the issue of whether the assassination of JFK was a high-level conspiracy having policy implications. No one has ever been willing to debate me on the subject. That is not because I am a brilliant debater, which I am not, but it is because the matter simply is not debatable by Chomsky or by anyone else, if the terms of the debate are fair.

I am convinced that Chomsky knows at some level of consciousness, as does almost everyone, that the assassination of JFK was a crime carried out by the highest levels of our national security state. I am convinced of it, because in our correspondence Chomsky absolutely refused to come to grips with the evidence. He took flight when confronted with incontrovertible evidence of a high-level conspiracy with policy implications. I am certain that he will never agree, as Jeff proposes, "to be challenged in a public forum by intelligent, thoughtful people" on the assassination. He has confessed to his ignorance on the subject. He has stated that he has no interest in the matter. But neither ignorance nor lack of interest has stopped him from pontificating on the assassination with self-appointed authority.

Contrary to what Chomsky contends, the military-intelligence murder of Kennedy is a simple fact that can be proven as any crime can be proven. But anyone who wishes to involve herself in U.S. politics cannot state publicly that she knows this to be a fact. When I started work on this case, I knew that I had separated myself forever from the possibility of ever having any voice in conventional U.S. politics.

On reflection I conclude that Chomsky is really not leading anyone away from the truth. He is merely providing a brilliant mind to lean on as an excuse for many on the left, who like Chomsky, choose not be face the truth about the assassination. For them he serves as a convenient rationalization not to speak out on the question. They would prefer to involve themselves in leftist politics rather than bearing witness to the dark truth of the Kennedy murder, and by so doing preserve their political voices. To speak the truth on the Kennedy assassination in our corrupt society renders one politically mute. Chomsky and the left love the sound of their voices, and will not have them silenced for something as unimportant as the killing of our head of state by the military and intelligence power.

But, dear friends, the truth about the Kennedy assassination cannot be employed as some of you apparently hope–as a mechanism for jump starting a progressive political movement which is willing to confront the true demises and utter corruption of our "democracy." Such a movement must see our "democracy" as a structure which finds the killing of a head of state for foreign policy reasons by the military-intelligence forces albeit regrettable but perfectly acceptable. Did I get that right, Marty?

Our "democracy" is eager to entertain debate about the mystery of he killing, when there is no mystery. Our society encourages this debate because the debate disguises the complete corruption of our politics, our media, our military, our politicians and our left. I choose not to join this debate, because to join it is to contribute to providing a fig leaf for evil.

Good people, right now Chomsky, the left, the center, and the right are all basically satisfied with the killing of Kennedy and its consequences. The empire is intact. The privileges continue to flow to all of us. We are free to criticize fecklessly while the national security state hunts around for another Kosovo to show off our bombing capacity, while we build our non-workable anti-missile defense system, while we continue educating the death squads through the School of the Americas, while we increase the arms budget, while we strip away social welfare, while we continue to describe the thrust of our foreign policy as humanitarian in nature though it never was, and while we continue to debate with Chomsky and the uninterested public.

I am sorry to opine that our cause will not transform this society. When serious politics in the world defeats our empire, and it will, then and only then will the truth of the killing of Kennedy be embraced. The truth of our causes cannot be a path to power in a nation where our satisfied people accept a "democracy" which accepts a military-intelligence cutting down of its elected president.

So, I cannot join in seeking to do what I feel would be a social wrong, i.e. to engage Chomsky in a debate which legitimizes the concept that the Kennedy assassination is shrouded in mystery. This debate, I believe, in turn serves to legitimize the state which killed Kennedy.

MM (10/7/99)

Vince, I'm afraid I agree with you that trying to pressure Chomsky into debating us is hopeless, but I was thinking that at least we could get him to clarify the word "lucid." But on second thought, that wouldn't clarify it either, because he might not admit now that he was (indirectly) admitting in his letter to you that he changed his opinion on the reasonableness of our concerns. So I guess we simply have to resign ourselves to the fact that we'll never know the truth about him. Easier said than done! I think we've been here before. This word "lucid," ironically enough, has had the effect of clouding things up, as far as our interpretation of Chomsky's position is concerned.

I cannot believe that Chomsky's obtuseness is his fear of losing his audience. He is already marginalized, as far as the mainstream is concerned, so how would Big Brother shut him off further? And since, as we know, conspiracy "theory" *is* rational, he of all people would have no trouble convincing other people that it is rational–if it was true that he now believes this.

The thing that makes Chomsky such an attractive target is his pontificating about rationality and logic–and speech and the human mind etc., if you get into his linguistics

stuff–as well as intellectual honesty, the responsibility of intellectuals, etc. Then you hear him on "conspiracy" and you feel like you've just seen the pontiff go into a whorehouse.

VS (10/7/99)

Italian oil can be put to better use than boiling Professor Chomsky, as one of you has suggested. Which reminds me of overhearing a breakfast conversation being conducted by an Italian, a Frenchman and a Jew.

The Italian boasted of the great sex which he had with his wife the prior night. He had completely covered his wife with Italian oil. After the encounter, he stated that his wife screamed for five minutes. The Frenchman told of using Normandy butter as a covering for his wife. After the experience his wife screamed for fifteen minutes. The Jew said he had used chicken schmaltz to cover his wife. She screamed for a full hour. He had wiped his hands on the drapes.

With respect to the evil nature of our empire, my emphasis is not on "our" but rather on "empire." I feel that absolute power possessed by any nation or any person is evil at its core. I do not feel that the human creature is structured to be able to handle absolute power without being steeped in evil in the process of administering and seeking to preserve the elements of power. I do not feel that the human creature will surrender absolute power because of confrontation with truth. Power, I believe, is surrendered because power is thwarted by some countervailing force or forces. Every empire eventually fails. No empire voluntarily, without countervailing force, ever relinquishes its privileges without being forced to do so.

MM (10/7/99)

We are now in possession of two eloquent and fully convergent descriptions of political reality status quo, and where we stand within it, namely between a rock (Vince) and a hard place (John Thomas).

In the world of literature, cinema, music, science, academia, whatever–where else is this dialogue taking place? Is it taking place in fiction, in art? I don't think so. In my humble opinion, I think we is where it's at.

MM (10/9/99)

John, do you realize you are demonstrating the truth about America being a religion when you say: "Not that America is a bad place. It is arguably the best place on earth"? How can it be, with all the grievous faults you mentioned? There's a book called *We're Number One* by Andrew L. Shapiro that shows exactly what number America is in relation to other countries in various fields: medical care, education, employment conditions, wealth distribution, etc. The fact is we're No. 1 in most of the bad stuff and well down the list in the good stuff. The only way you can still believe that America is the greatest country in the world is by a leap of faith. The comparison with religion is very apt.

Are you Catholic? I like to ask Catholics how they reacted to David Yallop's *In God's Name* (and other books), which revealed (convincingly enough to me) the Vatican to be nest of scheming, murderous vipers. How can they stay "Catholics," if they suspect the slightest truth in that theory–that the murder of John I (like that of JFK et al.) was an inside job? "It doesn't mean the whole Church is wrong, or the religion. It just means that some evil people sometimes manage to corrupt it." That's the usual response. In short, they accept it. They don't think of it that way–and probably don't think about it much at all–but they accept it.

This religion of America has spread all over the world. Not far from my house here in Krautland there's a woman who calls herself "Country Rose" and hosts a country music jamboree on her property every year. People show up from all over Germany in their campers and cowboy boots and hats. The main activity, in this big beer tent, aside from listening to the music, is rising dramatically from your seat on one of the long wooden benches, and striding–obviously weary from a long day in the saddle–over to the bar to continue what you've been doing all day, which is drinking beer.

The only difference between this and American Americanism is that here the beer is better, and there is much less likelihood that there will be a fight or a shooting. If there is, the culprits will not be arbitrarily executed, as in the US, depending on what state they kill the other person in, and when they go to jail they will live a much more humane existence than they would in an American jail.

I'm not going to go on like that because I am not a German chauvinist. My point is that there are a great many things in other countries that are better than in the United States. The US is the most powerful country, economically and militarily, but it is not arguably the best place on earth. It's home, John. That's all it is.

The "war on drugs" is a war for drugs. BB (Big Brother) loves drugs. Illegal drugs. It gives the gibbering masses something to live for, something to kill each other for, and provides a good excuse for a police state. Legalizing soft drugs would weaken this strategy, and legalizing hard drugs would destroy it. How can you fight a "war" when have no idea, or pretend to have no idea, who the enemy is? Go to Amsterdam and you will find, perhaps to your surprise, that Mary Jane is just the girl next door, rather, in the coffee shop, and a far cry from the diseased slut that BB has always told us she is. That may be in the process of changing, if my main source on the state of popular culture, Jay Leno, is any guide. Would he be allowed by BB's mouthpiece, NBC, to make constant jokes about Kevin and the band smoking weed unless the intended message was that it was actually ok? If Kevin and the band do it, admit it, and speak well of it, even "jokingly," does this not have the effect of decriminalizing it in the public mind?

Is BB good or evil? Is the Catholic Church good or evil? Are *The Nation* editors good or evil? Is Noam Chomsky good or evil? Is Jay Leno good or evil?

They certainly do evil. All of them. They do good things as well. Let us assume that Chomsky is in fact an agent of BB. Does that make him evil? It is simply very hard to think of the man as evil. He has produced too much good work, work that we would have produced ourselves if we could have. How can he be evil? And how can BB be evil, if people like Chomsky are working for him? I think we can assume he is doing so voluntarily. Allegiance at that level of intellectual sophistication can only be gained ideologically; he must believe in his cause, and ultimately in BB's cause. It is likely, though, that BB allows a great deal of freedom to his slaves–e.g., up to conspiracy theory but no further, since BB is the conspiracy and must remain unknown.

They need only be told what subjects to stay away from. Does anyone have any doubt that Jay Leno knows what subjects to stay away from, and what subjects to go for? Someone should do a study of this, if they haven't already. It's quite interesting, because here you are seeing the face of BB through humor, and it is very revealing. Just to take the example already mentioned–the jokes about marijuana and the band. This is BB–almost–telling us it's ok. The jokes about lawyers and OJ tell us that the legal system is hopelessly corrupt. The Clinton jokes tell us that the presidency is hopelessly corrupt. In

general, the jokes tell us that NBC will do and say whatever the hell they want to; they cannot be sued; they are BB. "The NBC family," as their jingle goes. We are part of the family by watching the shows. We are part of BB. Watch Jay. This is funny, and that's funny. No, not that. We don't talk about that. No, not that either. Clinton bad. Gore bad. Quayle bad. Perot bad. Colin Powell good. John McCain good. Bush Jr. bad. Compare all the jokes he *could* do, all the possible targets, with the relatively very few that he chooses and keeps repeating ad nauseam–the same transparent brainwashing techniques we see in the commercials. I don't know how this fits into BB's grand strategy, but this much seems clear.

For those who may be wondering, let me explain why it is impossible for me to ignore Chomsky. Chomsky is not only the leader of the left. I don't know what your feeling is about the true cause or causes of the assassination, but I believe the main reason was Vietnam. We have argued about this at length in the group, but I haven't changed my mind. It seems obvious to me. I do not concede that it was only one of many reasons. I believe that without Vietnam, JFK would not have been killed, and with Vietnam, any or all of the other presumed reasons (e.g., rapprochement with Castro, thawing of the Cold War) could be omitted and it would still have happened. That's what I mean by "main."

Ok. The war is the main reason for the assassination. JFK was killed because of his Vietnam withdrawal policy. Now, what keeps people off the streets, after the Stone movie? Many of us are still sore on the subject of Vietnam.

First of all, of course, the mass media keep the uninquisitive in darkness. Jay Leno doesn't make jokes about Vietnam or the assassination. But what about the more thoughtful people? Stone spelled it out very clearly. He even documented the film with a book.

The answer to the question is: Chomsky. The thesis that JFK was killed because of the withdrawal policy depends on the assumption that there was a withdrawal policy before the assassination, and that it was reversed almost immediately after the assassination. Remove that assumption, and you have no more thesis. JFK could not have been killed because of his Vietnam withdrawal policy, because there was no Vietnam withdrawal policy, or if there was one it did not change after the assassination.

Now, who is the man who managed to tell us this, despite Oliver Stone, the documentary record, and common sense? Who has destroyed, single-handedly, the assumption, which destroys the thesis, which destroys the message, which destroys any possible political reaction to the message?

You got it. Who else but the talented Mr. Chomsky could effectively achieve this feat? His only interest in the assassination is the one he debated with me at length and wrote a book about–the withdrawal policy. It did not exist. There was no change of policy.

The gnome is a giant in disguise. BB is not stupid. The transparency theory presumes intelligence. I suspect that the real nodes of power are not at all where we might suspect them to be.

I can only ignore Chomsky, then, if I ignore the assassination, the war, and perhaps even more importantly, the implications that his suspected complicity has for the sheer magnitude of the conspiracy we are up against. It's either that or the magnitude of my own paranoia.

As I said before, we are walking a thin line between paranoia and denial.

MM (10/9/99)

Joe, your take on academia is exactly the same as mine. The arrogance is absolutely mind-boggling. I mean, it's one thing to be wrong. But to be wrong and so damned self-righteous about it!

I think it's important to document these instances of arrogant and thoroughly pathological denial, as Ray has done, because it will show people later how it was. They may be facing a similar situation. We can't have too much evidence, because when the time comes that the Force is with us, as John says, all of those people will be busy telling us how they knew it all along. We don't see how that is possible now, but that's the way it will be. The Gnome will weasel out of it somehow. That's really what I was thinking of in the full-court press suggestion. I don't think we would change anything, but we could document his continuing denial. All of this was just prompted by Vince's curious (I think) interpretation of the word "lucid." We don't need it. Chomsky's state of denial is already well documented.

MM (10/11/99)

As to the exchange between John and Marty, I agree with Marty. And Ralph, Vince, Chomsky, Parenti, Thoreau, and many others. I suppose the applicable political label is "radical left," though I would prefer Thoreauvian conservative. The US is not a benevolent country. I know of no benevolent country. There are degrees of horror that all governments inflict on their own and other populations. Sometimes there are benevolent people who can manage to help others through government, and there are benevolent people who try to keep the government from causing as much damage as it would otherwise. That's a long way from saying the US is a benevolent country.

But in any religion, John, god is good, and if "America" is your religion, there can be no "analysis" at all. Does one analyze one's faith?

I am not prejudiced against believers, military or otherwise. Some, in fact most, of my best friends–and family–are believers. I am still a believer, too, if you scratch below the surface. I'll bet we'd all bleed red, white and blue–all the individuals named above–because we were all brought up in the same country.

I lost my faith because I have been forced (by facts and logic) to see that the god of this religion is false. Not the believers, most of them anyway, but the god. America is a false god. It is not the greatest country in the world, and it is not a benevolent country. That does not mean that the believers in America are false, or that they cannot be great or benevolent. It means I no longer believe in the god.

VS (10/13/99)

Back to the task of trying to come to the truth on the assassination of JFK, the motivation for the killing, the nature of the forces behind it, the consequences of the killing and society's failure to come to grips with the truth regarding it.

I believe that I personally have arrived at the truth. Here is how I have seen it and have tried to convey it to you and to others.

The national security state at its highest levels killed Kennedy. Kennedy was killed because he was viewed by it as seeking to thwart the national security state from exercising its enormous power to consolidate U.S. hegemony over the globe through military means. Kennedy thought that the national security state in its efforts to consolidate its power over the world through military means was risking the destruction

of the planet. The leaders of the national security state knowingly combined in a conspiracy to kill Kennedy and following the killing through its control of the U.S. media sought to control the minds of the U.S. citizenry by manipulating the debate on the assassination. This debate was intended to, and did accomplish, through Orwellian mind-control methods, the paralysis of the U.S. citizenry's thinking.

To participate in this debate, and not to cut to the simple and irrefutable evidence which points directly to a high level national security state killing is to enlist in the service of the killers.

The successful assassination permitted the national security state to slaughter millions in Vietnam, and tens of thousands in South and Central America through training the military forces there. The killing of Kennedy and the manipulation of the post-assassination debate facilitated the assassination by the intelligence forces of the national security state of decent, freedom-loving popular leaders here and elsewhere. As a consequence of the assassination the military-intelligence budget has been maintained in the absence of credible enemies at a rate so high that the society has seen fit in order to sustain these military budgetary outlays to cut away many of the welfare benefits.

Anyone who seeks to pervert the meaning of the assassination by urging that the evidence points to a low-level renegade conspiracy has contempt for the obvious truth, and by endeavoring to strip away the significance of the assassination is committing great injustice to the millions whose deaths have been made easy by that killing.

My dictionary defines evil as morally wrong or bad, harmful, injurious. Therefore, the national security state is by definition evil.

Every national security state operative, like every Nazi concentration camp operative, is not completely evil. But every national security state operative, like every Nazi concentration camp operative, while in the work of assisting the national security state and concentration camps is unquestionably involved in evil.

Care to comment?

MM (10/13/99)

John, you look at Newman's military intelligence and NSA background and say, "There is a very, very slight chance that he is still working with/for them." I look at it and say, "There is a good probability that this is so." Which speculation is more reasonable? Would it be more reasonable to be neutral? To say that there is no more likelihood of this man being an agent than anyone else?

You say your "sense" of him is that he is "legitimate." What is this "sense" based on? Do you trust every man who has ever worn a US military uniform? Do you trust him more or less, knowing that he was in intelligence? What is the most salient characteristic of intelligence agents and officers? That they keep secrets. What would make you trust such a person more, rather than less? And what do you mean by "legitimate"? That he is an honest man trying to find the truth? Why, then, did he not answer my letter, even after you went to bat for me (which should hardly have been necessary)?

But let's suppose he is honest. Suppose he really believes, deep in his heart, that the CIA as an institution is innocent. Then we get into the questions of good and evil, but did I say that he was evil? On the contrary, I posed the question, not only about him but about a number of people and things. I agreed with Ralph that he is part of the smokescreen. You don't have to be dishonest to be part of the smokescreen.

This relates directly to our discussion of Chomsky. My problem with Chomsky is that I have too much respect for him to think he could be part of the smokescreen without knowing it, and knowing exactly what he is doing, with all the consequences. I do not respect Newman nearly enough to pose that question of him.

I think, John, that you are flying only on faith, and that is the reason why you are defending Newman's faith. You are saying here that because the US has done some good in the world, Newman's point of view is "legitimate." What is your meaning of "legitimate" here? Would you like to defend the "legitimacy," or "benevolence," or at least non-malevolence, of many other governments that have done some good, in addition to the harm? Do you want to defend the Nazi's many domestic accomplishments (e.g., the autobahns). Of course not. I won't go on with that, but the point must surely strike you that just because a government does some good things does not mean that it is a good or benevolent government.

What "work" did Newman do on NSAM 263? I am not aware of any significant contribution by Newman to anything, frankly, except the false debate with Chomsky re Vietnam, and then this conclusion that the CIA (as an institution, of course–what else?) is innocent.

Those are the two significant, bottom-line contributions of Newman you have to take into account when you go back to the question of whether or not he is an agent or not. Whether he is "courageous" or not is really irrelevant. Many brave Germans died for Hitler.

On the question of institutional guilt, first of all, institutions, including banks and other business, get involved in conspiracies all the time, and occasionally get caught. When they do, I'd venture to say that it is usually not because of a paper trail. But you say all institutions use a lot of paper, so the CIA must have left a paper trail if it killed JFK. I see no connection at all between these two propositions. It's like saying I use toilet paper to wipe my ass, therefore I used it to suffocate my wife. It is much more logical to connect these two propositions: 1) The CIA is a top secret institution, accountable to no one (as you admit); 2) therefore they keep the bad things they do secret. Ok, add a third proposition: 3) If an institution wants to keep something secret, it does not leave a paper trail.

You say it is comical to consider the possibility that the CIA could keep a secret like this. What is comical is considering the possibility that the CIA or any other intelligence agency would leave a paper trail, except by accident, which they would be extremely careful to avoid, or that they would *not* do exactly what they consider it their highest responsibility to do, namely maintain absolute secrecy where national security is at stake, as defined by the president by law but by themselves in practice.

Of course the murder of the president was an "agenda item." But an agenda is not necessarily a piece of paper.

You are missing something very important. Who is managing the cover-up now? Those same "rogue agents" who got together in 1963? Do they control the entire government, and the media? How do they prevent an "innocent" CIA, FBI, Congress, etc. from doing their jobs, which should be to reveal the truth about the killing? These are Vince's questions, and they are logical.

If the government was/is innocent, if the CIA was/is innocent, why have they done everything in their power to prevent the truth from coming out?

Blaming the assassination on "rogue agents" is like saying the problem with the Gestapo was that not all the thugs were under control. If the institution cannot control its agents, it is out of control. Why defend them?

Newman exonerates the CIA without any justification whatever, except the ridiculous argument that this super-secret institution would have to have left a paper trail leading to their own conviction for their crimes.

MM (10/14/99)

Ralph, the stark reality is that the United States government, the land of the free and the home of the brave, was taken over in a military/intelligence coup that had nothing to do with JFK's economic policies.

Unless you consider his decisions not to invade Cuba or Vietnam economic policies. They were, of course, in effect, but I don't think JFK intended them as such. I do give the man credit for a certain amount of intelligence and humanity. I don't think he wanted to waste American lives, and risk a world war, over Cuba or Vietnam. Of course he might have thought either would be a waste of money, too, but on the other hand, he was intelligent enough to know (and if not there were plenty of people who would have told him) that war is never a waste of money but a very good investment, a stimulus to the economy, a windfall for Pentagon contractors, etc.

I do not have the same (minimal) respect for the intelligence or humanity of his killers. They were not politicians, and did not have to face the wrath of the public when the war started chewing them up. The military/intelligence "community" thrives on warfare, just as a large sector of the economy does. Hence they work together–big money and our military/intelligence rulers.

I'm sure JFK's belief in warmongering as sound and necessary economic policy was as firm as any other member of his class, but the difference was that he had to face the mothers. (He wasn't St. Matthew, as you say, but he was Irish.) You will have noticed that no president since him, however, has let such sentiments interfere with doing exactly what the military-industrial-intelligence complex, i.e. Big Brother, wants.

You know that I consider the Vietnam war to be the primary cause of the assassination. I consider that as obvious as the nose on my face. But it wasn't the only one. It was the sine qua non, but not everything.

What are the other reasons? Not his economic policies. Not his tiny steps towards rapprochement with Cuba and the Soviet Union. Do you really think they (BB) would pull a coup because of that? JFK could have been handled on those issues.

The second reason, and the only other significant reason, I think, for the coup, is TRANSPARENT. This is something we haven't talked about much, if at all, though to me it is the most significant and interesting aspect of Vince's work. It was a message–a message that BB had decided it was time to make.

Let me put it in his (BB's) words, to make it simple. I think it is simple.

"Look, the guy irritated me. He made a fool of me in Cuba, twice, and was about to do so again in Vietnam. I didn't like his wimpish gestures towards Communism, either, or his phony liberalism about race. I think it's time to put a stop to it. The future of the species is at stake, and I am the species. I think it's time to show them who's boss, in no uncertain way. That is, the ones unfortunate enough to figure it out. The others are working for me, one way or the other, just by not knowing. I'll make it plain enough. I'll even allow people like Salandria and Morrissey (and others) to go around yapping about

it. I won't take them out. I don't need to. They will have no effect whatsoever. I am totally in control. I am not stupid. I have learned from history. I know how to control people.

"Of this group–the ones who figure out what I after all have made as plain as the nose on their stupid faces, if they can bring themselves to look–there will two subgroups: those who accept it and those who don't. Those who don't will be totally marginalized and silenced, if necessary by force. Those who do will be given a lot of leeway in everything they do, with two limitations:

"1. The act of revelation itself is sacred. Only I, BB, can speak His name–as I did in Dallas by shooting JFK. Leave it alone. When it is time for me to give the world another message, I will do so. If you read the papers and watch TV with any care, you will see that my message is being broadcast all over the world, all day long. But anyway, Noam, Izzy, and the rest of you smart cookies (compared to what, though?), lay off the assassination. That is off limits.

"2. The streets are also off limits. If anybody starts stirring up the crowds, you better make sure whatever movement you're starting goes in a direction I approve of, or you're dead–one way or another.

"This last goes for the Salandrias and Morrisseys, too, but they might not know it. If they don't, too bad for them. They'll find out the hard way. Like Ventura. How long do you think I'm going to put up with him? But let's see what I can do with him first. I hardly think he will be a problem.

"Are the relatives of the TWA 800 victims a problem? The victims and relatives of Vietnam veterans? I can handle it, man. I can handle all of them, all of you. That's what I've been telling you, ever since Dallas.

"So now that you see it, you might as well join me. Obey rules 1 and 2, above, and the world's your oyster. Don't, and well, we'll see."

I want to understand the motivations of a Newman, a Parenti, and (especially) a Chomsky. Not necessarily because they are important as far as influencing other people is concerned (which they are), but simply because the closer I come to understanding them, the more I understand reality. It is simple curiosity.

It is the same curiosity that is making me write this overly long letter and try to understand your points of view. They are quite different, as we are perhaps now finally finding out for the first time. There was not much direct exchange in the old modus. Now we have more pressure to answer each other's questions, and I welcome this change.

I can't say the assassination itself is of much interest to me anymore, either. I don't follow the microdebate anymore. I, like Vince, feel I know who did it and why. I also think, as he does, that there's not a damn thing we can do to change things, except trust to the next government that it will be somewhat more just and humane than this one.

I know how that sounds, but after all, it is not very different from the plight of every other oppressed people that has populated the planet, except that (I hope) we are all considerably more comfortable in our oppression.

VS (10/15/99)

Let us now speak of paper trails. The first thing that Chomsky asked me to do in his correspondence with me was to produce a paper trail on the JFK assassination demonstrating that our secret intelligence services killed JFK. I am no admirer of U.S. intelligence, but I certainly wasn't going to consider them to be stupid enough to leave a paper trail of their role in the assassination. The only reason that any such paper trail

would have been left would be to implicate as a fallback position renegade elements and by so doing exculpate their own high-level institutional guilt. So, I disappointed Chomsky and never undertook the simple little task to which he assigned me.

How is the School District of Philadelphia different from the CIA? Only in degree. You will note in Kelin's anthology of my work a curious piece by me entitled "The Promotion of Domestic Discord." It is about Ocean-Hill Brownsville. In that piece I wrote about McGeorge Bundy's and the Ford Foundation's efforts to disrupt the New York School District.

In 1968 I was thrown into a Ford Foundation effort to disrupt the School District of Philadelphia in a remarkably similar experiment in city destabilization. By assignment of the Superintendent of Schools I was made a center piece of the operation. This I thought was most curious, since I was a low-level functionary and had no idea how the Superintendent even knew who I was.

I took careful notes. I documented everything that I observed. I was in the center of the storm. I kept and still have extensive files on the case. The situation was rich with an imminent teachers' union strike, a radical ex-Communist teacher who was being targeted by the students and community for transfer because he did not have sufficient knowledge of black history (although I learned and his union was not advised by him that he was getting a doctorate in black history from an Ivy League university), and the radicals in the community were given one-half million of Ford Foundation seed money to support the community's efforts and were prepared to man the schools in the event of a strike by the teachers. I attended secret meetings of the cabinet where plans were made over my objections to frame the "innocent" teacher who was at the center of the scene. The teachers' union geared up for a strike in support of their victimized member.

I defused the matter by having a secret meeting of the union leaders in my home. I showed them the Zapruder film. They did not bite on the invitation to strike. The teacher was never transferred. He then became the leader of the black caucus of the teachers' union. Although I had been assigned by the Superintendent to be in the middle of the matter, no one in the Administration wanted to know what I had learned notwithstanding my constant efforts to share my findings.

When the Superintendent was leaving his position, he spoke to a small gathering and described this episode as "HIS experiment in community control of the schools." To his credit he did not use the renegade dodge. There is not a piece of paper extant which details this plot except in my files. Why did I write about the Ford Foundation's efforts in New York, and why did I never discuss publicly what I knew about the Philadelphia experiment? Why have I even now not revealed the details of what I know about that episode? Why won't I share the details of this material with you now? Why should you for a moment trust me, a reasonably truthful and decent person, who has spent some 44 years as a District bureaucrat, to tell you about the School District of Philadelphia's dirty secrets?

Answer these simple questions and you will have answered the question of whether you should trust any former U.S. intelligent agent to reveal the full truth on what he knows about U.S. intelligence. Let me assure you that you can trust me not to conceal some of the dirty linen about the District to the same degree that you can trust a resident of a whorehouse not to be either a whore or the madam.

On the issue of renegade vs. CIA and U.S. intelligence forces having been behind the assassination, please look at Jack Anderson's most recent book. I don't know its name. I just scanned it in a book shop. He speaks of the CIA's efforts to kill Castro as backfiring and leading to the killing of JFK. This story, when it surfaced many years ago in the Drew Pearson column, struck me as the direction of retreat which the U.S. government would ultimately take when the Warren Report, which I felt was designed to fall apart, eventually collapsed. When this collapse occurred, I felt that then our national security state would ease its way into a backup explanation. Of course, Bobby Kennedy would be fed into this tableau for his having been involved with the CIA in toying with anti-Castro activity. Of course, this would also demonstrate the national security state's solicitude for the Kennedy family's feelings. This is the same kind of solicitude which the national security state demonstrated in not having the Warren Commissioners examine the x-rays and photographs of the autopsy, or in revealing what Jackie Kennedy testified to as to the nature of the President's wounds.

This is the "nightmare" scenario which is being pressed upon us now by Newman. There is nothing systemically wrong with our national security state. Renegades caused the assassination. As an organization, Newman would point out that the CIA never would have considered killing our head of state–only other heads of state.

This theory strips the assassination of any policy significance. If you accept this scenario, you do not differ from the U.S. intelligence story that is being leaked. If you accept this theory, there is no societal importance attached to the killing of Kennedy other than as an intriguing mystery. How does this theory, even of a high-level renegade killing stack up with the old evidence which I reviewed in my 1998 Dallas speech? How does our theory of a plot at the highest levels of U.S. military-intelligence specifically designed to change Cold War policy depend on new secret documents which Newman analyzes and comments upon with a show of such academic erudition?

MM (10/18/99)

Marty says about the transparency theory:

It is too mechanical for my sensibilities. I also feel that the powers-that-be put a lot of time and energy into a form of mind control in which people in general (and people like John Thomas in particular) are encouraged to believe they live in a democracy. So to openly assassinate the President as a way of telling everybody they are in control–no, it doesn't make sense.

I would say it makes does sense, the more intelligence you give the conspirators credit for. A two-track strategy is not only conceivable, but likely, and this is what the transparency theory implies: one for those who don't see it (that they've got us by the balls), and one for those few who do. Those who do can either collaborate (I can see Chomsky as one of these), making some compromises in return for other freedoms, or oppose them (like Vince). Those who do nothing join the collaborators, of course. The Vince group, obviously, is very small–even within the Vince group!

As for RFK's behavior after JFK's murder, I have no insight in this whole question of the family reactions. Ted Kennedy said after Congress voted to re-open the files, "I think you'll find that the Warren Commission was the most responsible party." A very enigmatic statement, when you think about it. We had our fun with "lucid"; think what we could do with "responsible"! But it does seem to indicate that he thinks he knows

something we don't. I would be very surprised if he didn't. He too has been cooperating, all these years, after the facts. He had two lessons, after all.

But what I don't get is why anybody in the family stays in politics. Is it because in their hearts they believe the system is salvageable? That would mean that they really don't know more than we do, but less! Or maybe they are just as cynical as we are and just stay in the game for what it's worth. I haven't a clue.

VS (10/18/99)

John, you now have me right. I mean and have always meant literally that the national security state killed Kennedy just as it killed other popular leaders here and in other countries. Yes, I mean that your position is not discernibly different from the position which will now be put in the forefront by witting and unwitting agents of the state. They will get the attention of the U.S. media.

Please, John, reread my speech delivered in Dallas. I left no doubt there as to whom I though ordered the killing of Kennedy, arranged for the cover-up and continues to operate as our rulers. Please tell me how each of the following matters could have transpired without the defense Establishment from its very top giving directions?

*Killing Oswald.

*Using a CIA agent as a patsy with full knowledge that the CIA would not take umbrage.

*Silencing of the left, the ACLU, all of the liberals.

*Spreading of false clues pointing to the Soviets and Cuba as the killers while exculpating them from blame by offering them a single-assassin, no policy-significant alternative to the truth.

*Ignoring overwhelming evidence of more than one gunman and getting the press to play along with a single-assassin fantasy.

*Relying on a single-assassin concept which defied physical laws.

*Framing the Mafia.

*Impersonating Secret Service Agents at the scene of the killing.

*Contradicting all of the Parkland Hospital doctors' findings of an evulsive back of the head wound and wound of entry in the neck.

*Ignoring the clear and conclusive evidence of the hole in Kennedy's shirt and coat which put the lie to the single bullet story.

*Autopsy doctors accepting the orders of the generals and admirals not to resect the neck and back wounds, thereby aborting the autopsy.

*Commander Humes burning the autopsy notes in his home most certainly under orders from above.

*The censorship of the Zapruder film for so many years.

*Foreclosing the Commission examining the x-rays and photographs of the Kennedy body.

*The refusal from the beginning and continuing today to acknowledge what the Zapruder film plainly shows in terms of a multiple assassin killing.

*Getting *Life* magazine to lie about Kennedy turning around when he had not.

*Getting *Life* magazine to change a single issue twice in order to conceal a hit on JFK from the right front.

*Massive criminality having been committed in obstructing justice by Bundy, Rankin, Specter, Warren, Katzenbach, Dulles, Henry and Claire Booth Luce and so many more.

*Accepting CE 399 as anything other than a plant.

*Specter, instructing the public that we must rely on the "conclusions and the stature of the men of the Commission."

*Instructing the presidential plane and Cabinet plane that there was no conspiracy and that Oswald acted alone when there was no evidence that Oswald was involved and enormous evidence of conspiracy.

*Removing the presidential limousine from the scene of the crime and refitting it with the consequent destruction of vital evidence.

*Deleting the wound testimony of Jackie Kennedy.

*Drying, cleaning and pressing the Connally clothing.

*Congress taking no action for years although every public opinion poll showed our public believed there was a conspiracy.

*Katzenbach instructing the Chief Justice to disclose that Oswald did it alone before he undertook his assigned job of determining what really happened.

*Dulles suborning Marina to perjury.

*Claire Booth Luce misleading Gaeton Fonzi, who was an agent of Congress.

*Appointing Dulles to the Commission.

*Not prosecuting the Paines.

*Continuation today of the media acting like obedient lap dogs to the military Establishment by turning a blind eye to the navy's shooting down of TWA Flight 800.

*The media buying into the "accidental" bombing of the Chinese embassy in Belgrade.

John, there is no business like chauvinism.

VS (10/19/99)

Today's *Philadelphia Inquirer*, under the headline "NATO denies deliberate attack on China's Belgrade embassy," quotes Secretary of State Madeline K. Albright as stating: "Now what the Chinese were doing at that embassy clearly, there is information that they were carrying on intelligence activities, but we in no way–and I want to make this absolutely clear–that the story is wrong."

We knew that the Chinese were conducting intelligence activities and communicating with the Serbs with regard to these activities. We therefore had to be tracking their radio transmissions from the embassy. Therefore, we had to know the exact location of the Chinese Embassy. Institutional?

Mike, apparently my School District story was not clearly put. I was not on the side of the teacher, nor the teachers' union. I was representing the District. The District in my judgment was being used by higher forces to destabilize itself and the city. The strike by the union, if it had occurred, would have been ostensibly with the purpose of preventing the teacher from being transferred. But in fact, the strike was being provoked in order to provide the opportunity for the community black power radicals who were financed by the Ford foundation to take over the schools and to teach with the black teachers who would have in large part remained on the job in the event of a strike. Such a strike would have divided Jewish radicals from the new left radicals (the teacher was Jewish), unionists from the new left, white teachers from black, etc.

I was placed in a key position in the affair because I apparently had a reputation from my work in the Kennedy assassination for being able to spot a frame up. The teacher was being, albeit happily, framed for not knowing black history.

What I was expected to do was to spot the frame up and to help the union go to the streets by so informing them. What I was not expected to do was discover that the radical teacher was not a radical at all, but was an agent provocateur. The teacher refused to be transferred to the best school in the city. He showed no anxiety when hoards of students and community activists verbally attacked him. Instead of concern for his own safety, he kept praising me for my courage. The teacher showed no concern about the fact that the community had somehow been given his personnel file, which revealed that he had been a communist. But when I leaked to the press that he might be an intelligence agent, he came in with his lawyer and threatened to sue me for libel.

If I had publicly revealed what the Ford Foundation, the Superintendent, and the Board of Education were up to, the newspapers would have declared me mad. I would have been separated from my employment. No one in the District could ever trust me again on any assignment. I would have been viewed as dangerous to public education.

VS (10/19/99)

John, in answer to your questions:

1. Yes, I know that there is a U.S. national security state. I know that orthodox U.S. scholars have documented its existence and its purposes. I have proven through legal evidence offered by the U.S. government and our media that the killing of President Kennedy employed on a wide scale our taxpayer monies to send a substantial crew of killers to Dallas. That kind of allocation of resources does not occur in any bureaucratic structure without tremendous institutional support throughout. Yes, the readings I have done on the recently released governmental documents demonstrate to me that JFK had been marginalized in our national security state. To employ the words of the generals and admirals, they felt that he had "screwed" them in the Bay of Pigs, Missile Crisis, Vietnam, Test Ban Treaty, and in his efforts to accommodate to the Soviets and Cuba. The CIA, the Joint Chiefs, the State Department, and the Congress, including Fulbright, were fighting his efforts at mollifying the Cold War. So, yes, the evidence tells me that the National Security Institutions were and are wholly corrupted by a dedication not to national defense but instead to world domination. "Are" because in absence of any credible enemies, these warfare state hogs devour more and more discretionary budget monies while our poor have the welfare system stripped from under them.

2. Yes, certainly, meetings were held. Don't, please don't ask me to tell you who attended the meetings and ask me to produce a paper trail of those meetings. But do you think that the killing of Kennedy with the organization it required of resources was done without meetings? Which governmental agency resources were used? They were national security state resources paid for by you in part. Resources are not marshaled in a bureaucracy without meetings being held.

3. Do I agree that the national security state is still actively involved in the cover-up. Absolutely! Are they "fascist, like-minded individuals?" They are people who cooperated in the killing of a president and covering up the motive for the killing. They believe in a democracy which will accept a killing of the head of state and leaving unquestioned immediate policy changes which follow immediately upon that killing that

lead to millions of deaths. Are they therefore fascists? Call them what you want. Am I angry with them? To this I plead most guilty.

4. Am I willing to go beyond the "defense Establishment" in attaching blame for the assassination? I am willing to examine the war Establishment and their civilian media and industrial allies. Up to now, I think that I can make out a good legal case for the guilt of the war Establishment. Please don't ask me for paper trails to the industrial allies. I have already demonstrated paper trails to the media. All of us have seen these obvious proofs of media complicity in the cover-up. Later, we should find that civilian corporate structures were involved in the planning, I am most willing and eager to examine such evidence. But I do not feel that it is forthcoming, since such signals of approval or directions would be issued most subtly and would be next to impossible to prove as we have proven a case against the war Establishment.

5. Was institutional support of the war Establishment provided for the killing of Kennedy? How else would you explain McGeorge Bundy instructing the presidential party and the Cabinet immediately–before there was any evidence against Oswald–that there was no conspiracy and Oswald was solely guilty? If there had not been an immediate circling of the wagons behind an institutional killing how would you get immediate cooperation from the Situation Room of the White House, U.S. Intelligence, the generals and admirals in the autopsy room, Earl Warren taking orders from Katzenbach, CE 399 not being declared a plant, the Zapruder film not being shown to the public, *Life* magazine lying to the public and changing its issues to conceal a head hit, etc. etc.? Innocent institutions would have protected their asses and kept their options open.

VS (10/20/99)

In the case of a civilian corporation, the defendants are the individuals and the corporate entity. The courts view such matters as institutional and individual wrong doing. The courts don't require formal board meetings for such a finding to be reached. Individual and corporate wrong doing are not mutually exclusive concepts. Rather, they are mutually inclusive.

John, you see Marty, Ralph, Mike and me as having no regard for American democracy. We all love democracy. We all passionately hate the undermining of U.S. democracy. I think I speak for the four of us when I state that we do not feel that the killing of President Kennedy by the National Security State was in the interests of American democracy. On the contrary, we feel that this assassination shredded the constitution and U.S. democracy. The assassination was a declaration to those who understood that civilian authority had given way to military-intelligence control of foreign policy, the federal budget, the media, and academia.

Oh, the constitution was still unchanged in terms of its wording. But in fact as a governing document it had been shredded. The Soviet constitution under Stalin declared Soviet Russia to be a workers' state in control of the Soviet workers. In fact, I saw Soviet Russia as Stalin's tyranny in which the workers were rendered subservient to his wishes. Trotskyites saw Russia under Stalin as a corrupt workers' state which deserved support, but attacked Stalin as a usurper of the workers' revolution and of its institutions. They did not pretend that the constitution under Stalin had any real significance in providing guarantees of the rights of the Soviet workers. You, John, don't see the killing of Kennedy as a corruption of the constitution and of the vital U.S. institutions. You see the

killing as not having seriously affected U.S. democracy negatively, and as not having demonstrated its corruption and the corruption of its institutions. I see the butchering of President Kennedy as having had a devastating effect on U.S. democracy. The assassination revealed as a giant sun would, shining into the depths of the U.S. power structure, the deep and dark corruption of our entire society.

I saw, as you must have seen, civilian aspects of the U.S. government, the military-intelligence services, the military-industrial complex, academia (Ralph Brown and a few others excepted), the media, and the Kennedy family as all combining to conceal the truth of the assassination. How can you not see the coming together in massive criminality all of these U.S. institutions as anything other than the death knell of substantive, meaningful democracy? All of these institutions are accessories after the fact, and therefore all are criminally and institutionally involved in the assassination. The killing of Kennedy is more than distant history. The killing of Kennedy is still an open murder case. The critical policy changes which resulted from his murder, and the critical policy changes which he was beginning to produce, (e.g. Cuba) and could not be made because of his death, are still affecting our world.

You complain that we are not offering a program to remedy all of this horrible corruption. That is true. We are merely trying to bear witness to the truth to demonstrate the corruption which the killing and its cover-up reveal in our institutional structures.

You ask us with what we intend to replace this massive corruption? I have some thoughts on this, but no concept of how that will be achieved here in this country at this sad moment in U.S. history. We frankly would welcome positive suggestions on how to achieve changes which are necessary. In fact as to what I would like to see our present state of our society replaced, I would ask for the following. A society with:

*No one as rich as I am.

*A basic subsistence wage for all.

*Concern for the billions of poor throughout the earth.

*Concern for the ecological disaster which a relatively unregulated global market driven economy is causing on earth.

*Less secrecy.

*Less arms.

*Less U.S. global hegemony.

*Less propensity for war and more reliance on peaceful diplomacy.

*Less military bases around the world.

*A free press with a willingness to examine all aspects of government–including its very legitimacy.

*Contempt for and not support of death squads.

*More and better schools, less than 1.8 million in prisons.

*No 2.1 billion dollar B-2 bombers.

*No horrible black ghettos.

I accept the need for a police force, a military, and yes, even a CIA. But in accordance with Roger Hilsman's article in the September/October 1995 issue of *Foreign Affairs*, "The United States should get out of the business of both espionage and covert political action" (p. 116). Hilsman said further:

The details can be debated but it seems obvious that the CIA and the entire intelligence community should be subjected to a thorough examination of some

fundamental decisions made about the kind of intelligence organizations the United States needs in an age no longer dominated by a cold war with the Soviet Union.

The national security state in my judgment is far, far more powerful than is compatible with democracy here and elsewhere. So much power that enables it to kill a President and have all of our institutions rally around to protect its monstrous killing is evidence enough that such power is not compatible with meaningful democracy. Again, my interest in the Kennedy killing is merely to bear witness to the truth. What, if anything, people decide and can do politically to reveal and to come to grips with the enormous corruption which this killing reveals in our institutions is up to the people here and throughout the globe to decide for themselves. I desperately hope that when our empire falls, as it must, under the force of opposition that it, like all empires, must generate, that it will fall to the application of peaceful strategies which will enable this precious planet to survive.

MM (10/23/99)

Revisionism vs. Revolution–isn't that what it boils down to? Marty and Vince, if I understand you right, think that what should happen will happen only after the US is actually defeated militarily or economically (i.e., falls apart), or if there is a global catastrophe, like nuclear war or rampant plagues. (I think we have such a plague right now; it's called AIDS.) I don't take this as revolutionary. What is it?

It is very, very pessimistic. I'm not going to say I don't have similarly dark moments, but I hate to imagine you feeling that way all the time. The only hope you allow yourselves is that the next (conquering) government, or whatever rises up from the holocaust, will be better. But this hope is illogical. There is no reason whatsoever to assume that the next "world order" would be better, and plenty of reason to think it would be worse. Would you really like to live in a country governed as Cuba is today? What other country would you like to be conquered by? And the other alternative, the holocaust, can hardly be something to pin one's hopes for mankind on. Tabula rasa? Is that the only way, Marty, that you can see mankind coming to his senses? If you really think that, how can you get up in the morning?

I subscribe to all the things Vince listed for radical improvement. I'll bet John subscribes to them too. Are they revisionary changes, or revolutionary changes? Can they be both? Maybe they are two words, and one concept. The same thing. We are arguing about nothing.

How do we get less secrecy, for example? Abolish or reform the CIA? Once you even start discussing that, you are well in the revisionist camp, because you have accepted the legitimacy of the state. So when we discuss whether something was an "institutional" conspiracy or not, that is all we're talking about–whether the CIA should be abolished or reformed: revisionism.

I myself think the CIA should definitely be abolished ("smashed into a thousand pieces" was Kennedy's expression, wasn't it?), but I am still a revisionist, just like John, because if I didn't think that getting rid of it would help society as a whole, I wouldn't recommend it. Why would I?

So I don't think we have two fronts here. It's not Vince, Marty, Ralph and Mike vs. John. I don't mind categorizing myself as a revisionist too, because I don't see any other alternative. Chomsky said once in answer to a question about "what to do" that he would start with the American Constitution. Not throw it out, but follow it. Account for

all the taxpayers' money, make Congress declare the wars, etc. I agree with that. I wouldn't have anything against a new constitution, but I don't think it's absolutely necessary.

Aren't we all, in fact, revisionists?

Do I accept the legitimacy of the state, then? How can I, if I believe that Dallas was a coup d'état? That's true. I should say, then, that I accept the legitimacy of our original form of government, before it was overcome by the new form of government that is now in place. Or, I accept the principles, but not the current manifestation of the principles.

People say this all the time: Give the government back to the people. I heard John McCain say it recently. I'm sure this idea is rampant in many parts of the population–the militias, all extremist groups, the "underclass." So my attitude is not a bit different in this respect from that of a great many people, including a popular senator.

John, you said at one point that "we" (Vince, Marty, Ralph? and me) were intent on destruction because we were disappointed with reality. Two points. First, change, including radical change, must include the destruction of the previous status quo. That is the definition of change. That's how you make omelets, right?

Second, I'm not disappointed (enraged is more like it) with reality but with the lack of reality. Not the knowledge that the world is like it is but the realization that I am being actively prevented from understanding what the world is really like.

Let's look at ourselves objectively. We are a pitiful lot. We are convinced that the government doesn't work the way it should, but we have nothing more than vague suspicions about how it really does work. On top of that we are told we are a democracy, an open society. Yet in all of history, what people have been so successfully duped? I think even medieval peasants, and the Germans under Hitler, were well aware of how their government worked. They might not know the intricacies, but they had a clear idea of who the most powerful people were who ultimately ran their lives.

Do we know this? Is what we are told about how the government works really the way it works? Is the president the head of state? Can we say this after Dallas? If not him, then who? Christ, even a Martian landing on earth would be astounded. Everybody on the planet knows who their leader is except Americans. Who is our leader, our leaders? Who runs the country? Who makes things happen? Who starts the wars? Who shoots the presidents? Who runs the cover-ups? We don't know, do we? Everybody who thinks he knows is dreaming, one dream or another. Nobody knows.

That is, somebody, some people know. Maybe Chomsky knows. That's what really pisses me off about him, and others like him. What right do they have to deprive us of the knowledge of the reality of our situation? We talk about Big Brother. Why don't we know his name/their names? What other people cannot name their leaders?

If the Martian told you, "Take me to your leader," you wouldn't be able to do it. Neither would I. I would take him to (a representative) of our ostensible leader, who I know is really not our leader at all. I'd really be curious if somebody could come up with an example from history of a comparable situation. I think it's pretty unique. The irony of it! All this knowledge around, and we don't even know who runs the government, or how. All we have is "theories" and expressions like "Big Brother," the "military-industrial-intelligence complex," the "ruling class," etc.

VS (10/25/99)

Gary mentioned a book by Jim Hougan on Watergate. My personal opinion is that Jim Hougan's book, *Secret Agenda, Watgergate, Deep Throat and the CIA*, 1984, New York, Random House, is one of the best investigative reporting jobs of our age. I feel that it is in the same class as Gaeton Fonzi's *The Last Investigation*. No library of any truth seeker should be without either book. Thank you, Gary, for bringing this to our attention.

VS (10/26/99)

Back to the Philadelphia School District story, in answer to Mike's questions, the Ford Foundation money had to be accepted by the Board of Education in a public meeting, and the final acceptance was contingent upon the passing of a formal resolution by the Board. Openly in the public Board meeting the Ford Foundation proposal excited the wrath of a brave Board member who publicly declared that the fund was going to be used to divide up the community.

The people who lead the community groups got the money. The police informed us when certain beleaguered administrators sought to have arrests made of persons who were committing crimes in the schools that the community leaders were being paid by the District and were therefore our agents to create the disorder.

The cabinet meeting was a gathering of cabinet members of the Superintendent's cabinet. Yes, they openly talked of framing the teacher. They instructed an administrator who was a friend of mine that he was to go into the classroom of the teacher and conclude that his teaching was unsatisfactory. When I stupidly interjected that to conclude that a teacher was unsatisfactory before there was any evidence against him, such an unsatisfactory rating was a frame-up. I stated that no administrator should be assigned the task of framing someone in the absence of evidence against him. I dumbly pointed out that such a determination of unsatisfactory service in the absence of evidence violated Anglo-Saxon principles of justice. I was then advised by a high-placed administrator who later was shot in California by the SLA that "The needs of social justice rise above Anglo-Saxon principals of evidence." The administrator assigned to conduct the frame, based on my advice, refused to participate in the scheme.

Later, as I have informed you, the superintendent explained that this affair was his experiment in community control. What is this about, you ask? Mike, I do not feel that the elite want students who will likely become unemployed urban ghetto blacks to be educated in a calm and pedagogically-sound environment. A solid education would equip them to counter politically a system which they might view as oppressive. Forgive me for being skeptical when elite foundations bear gifts to the poor to educate them on how to organize the community to overturn an oppressive system which serves the interests of the elite and seeks to hold down the poor.

What I meant by showing the Zapruder film is that I literally showed the Zapruder film to the union leaders. They were intelligent people and realized from the film the horrors which power was capable of perpetrating in our society.

The teacher was not transferred because the frame-up and the teachers' strike which were designed to catalyze the chaos which the Ford Foundation apparently sought never materialized.

The teacher was white and needless to say, like Ruby and Specter, Jewish. He was made the leader of the union's black caucus because he was–contrary to the impression he conveyed to his black students–extremely sophisticated in black history. The union

leaders did not publicize what I had made known to them as my view of the situation. But they acted, or rather refused to act (strike), based on my assessment.

The teacher remained as a teacher. Did he know what he was doing? I would think so. The community leadership had gotten his personnel file which they viewed as identifying him as a Communist. They advised him that they were prepared to make the information in his file public. He was unmoved by the threat. But when I revealed to the underground press that I believed he was an intelligence agent, he came in with a lawyer and threatened to sue me.

Michael, Marty and I don't see our only hope in the wish that the next conquering government will establish a better world order. We will not bow to or support any world government which conquers its way to global power. I have stated that the problem with "our empire" is not that it is "OUR empire" but that it is an all-powerful global empire. All empires, in our judgment, are inimical to human freedom and well being.

I feel that after our empire falls, as it must, there will be an enormous amount of distaste for Pentagonism and world hegemony by any single or combination of national states. What kind of political structure or structures regional or global, will then be organized to help regulate the global economy so that the needs of humankind can be addressed in a more equitable manner? I said that I have no specific program in mind that will accomplish this. I said that the peoples of the world will have to combine to formulate and effectuate what they deem to be the governance system or systems best suited to their needs.

I personally feel that hope for a better world would combine the best elements of market and command economies and thereby would reduce the inhumanity of which both systems have been guilty.

How would I define myself in terms of being a conservative, revisionist or revolutionist? Are labels much help in the definition process? With respect to what the CIA did to the U.S. constitution by killing JFK, I am a conservative. I chose our constitution as it was before this killing over the covert power of the CIA which through the killing of President Kennedy became preeminent. Oh, I would prefer a constitution that is more solicitous of civil liberties than property rights, but I, like you, Michael, will for now settle for what we had before the CIA flexed its covert musculature and killed President Kennedy.

The proposals I made to our correspondents for a better society would appear to be revisionist in nature. If the society is able to be changed in those and other directions and is thereby enabled to address the needs of the poor without revolution, that would be fine with me. I much prefer peaceful revisionism to the chaos and violence which is so common to revolution and to the Thermidor which all too often follows revolution as the night follows day. I feel that a 90% income tax on people like me, and the truncation of the war budget by 75% would go far in meeting almost all of my needs for change.

As you have probably gathered by now, because of my weak stomach I am non-violent and cannot bring myself to maim, torture or kill even to accomplish what I consider to be social justice. But I am enormously privileged. I am not so arrogant that I would impose my convictions on the underprivileged masses who might view force as the only practicable means of separating me from the property. I hope that they won't have to employ violent means to gain their end, but since I know something about the

misery of poverty, I would understand if they feel differently from me about the sanctity of non-violence.

Michael puts to us the question of who are the persons who control power in the United States? He would like us to be able to name the names of our rulers. My answer is that we have become more and more a plutocracy. Who can deny that elections here are bought with money? That the military-industrial complex is fueled with money? That the military protects our monied interests throughout the globe? That the social wages of our society are being reduced while individual wealth continues to concentrate in greater and greater mounds among the rich? That the rich and the poor are not equal in terms of rights in our society? So, in my judgment the power that controls our nation is money and greed for more money. That is as close as I need to come to naming names.

VS (10/27/99)

After reading John's two latest mailings to Gary and Mike, I am at a loss to define our differences. Certainly, John and I have in our beliefs and conclusions far, far more in common than we have differences.

I agree with John's view of Watergate. Jim Hougan in *Secret Agenda* does not in my opinion get at the nub of the cause for Watergate nearly as effectively as John does. But he does effectively tie the whole matter to the CIA. I quote from page 372:

Neither Woodward nor Bernstein was in a position to define that crisis, to break the story, or to say how it impinged on Watergate. But, as we have seen, the evidence is overwhelming that the retirements of Hunt and McCord had been fabricated by the CIA. Hiring the Cubans under false flags, they conducted domestic operations on behalf of the CIA's Security Research Staff, using the White House as a deniable cover in the event of the operation's exposure. That this was an institutional commitment of the CIA, rather than some "runaway" operation conducted by rogue agents, is plain. The support given to Hunt, McCord and Liddy came from a broad array of agency components: the Central Cover Staff (which helped to arrange Hunt's work, for Mullen Company, the Medical Services Staff (which provided psychological profiles), the Technical Services (Bank and Boom) Division (which provided disguises, clandestine cameras, voice-alteration equipment, etc.), the Office of Security (which provided safehouses for secret meetings with Hunt and Liddy), the CIA's graphics section (which prepared the Gemstone charts), the Clandestine Services Division etc. etc... How many other sections of the CIA may have been involved, if any, is unknown, but, clearly, the assistance was so broad and so deep that one can only conclude that institutional sanction had been given, Secretly. "Unofficially." But definitely.

The value of Hougan's book is to demonstrate beyond question that Watergate was a CIA operation. That clearly Nixon was not using the CIA, but rather was being used and destroyed by the CIA. I share with John the view that the purpose was to destroy Nixon for the reasons set forth by John. If we are to accept the Bernstein and Woodward concept of two brave reporters bringing down a President, then the Warren Report has to be verity, because other members of our free mainstream press would have come to grips with the fallacies and would have had a great scoop.

MM (10/27/99)

On the School District story, Vince, your original point was that this was an example of how a person working for an institution cannot reveal the whole truth about it. You were comparing this with Newman's situation, of having worked for army

intelligence and NSA. That point, I must tell you, is now lost on me. You have told us the whole truth about Philadelphia. Who cares what the names were? I didn't ask Newman for names, when I wrote to him. He could have answered my letter the same way you did, honestly, without jeopardizing anyone personally.

Yes, you may say, but you were not able to talk about it at the time, when you were still employed by the School District. Yes, I can see that. If you had gone public with your reading of the situation then, you would have had no concrete evidence and would have been easily painted as a nut.

But that is still different from Newman, who is supposed to be a "civilian" now. If your analogy held, he would be free, now, as you are, to tell the truth (without naming names). So you can't say that just because somebody worked for an institution he can never tell the truth about it, or enough of the truth to get the message across but without cracking heads. You have just done it.

I wanted to know the details because I am interested in how people react to things and what motivates them. I don't know why I'm interested in that, but I don't why one would not be, either. There is also a practical aspect. If I could do what you did with the Zapruder film, I would do it every chance I could. It is certainly worth emulating as an example of a successful effort to use the assassination as means of enlightening and thereby perhaps influencing people.

MM (10/29/99)

Vince and John, if you read my thing in *Looking for the Enemy* on the "Watergate Coup" you'll see that we agree. [*I had not read Hougan's* Secret Agenda *when I wrote* Looking for the Enemy *(Ch. 3.1 "The Watergate Coup: Nixon as Scapegoat," but I also surmised that the CIA was behind Nixon's downfall, and speculated that the reason was to provide a scapegoat and "closure" for the Vietnam war. --MDM*]

Gentle(wo)men, we should not fail to note that we have an extraordinary amount of agreement here. We are calling the Watergate episode a CIA coup just like Dallas. Why it happened is less important than the fact that it happened, and that we know it. The gap between us and the politically correct perception of reality is enormous.

The worst of it all is not all the blood that has been spilled, but the fact that THEY HAVE STOLEN OUR REALITY. I would love to see people get really pissed off about this. They have substituted the mystery of life, which is common to us all, with the petty, manmade, utterly unworthy mystery of their own secret machinations against us.

VS (10/29/99)

Mike is interested in the hypothesis that the killers of Kennedy were interested in having the conspiracy to a certain extent transparent so that the true nature of their power would be discernible to those who would be inclined to confront the killers. I have set this theory forth in "the Assassination of President John F. Kennedy: a Model of Explanation" and in "The Design of the Warren Report, to Fall to Pieces."

To my friend, Professor Thomas Katen, I owe the brilliant insight which he has characterized as the "transparent conspiracy". Tom propounded the view that the Warren Report was not a cover-up, but rather was a transparent conspiracy, the purpose of which was to reveal the assassination to be a conspiracy although the Report seemed to have been endeavoring to prove a single assassin killing.

Tom's concept was that the Warren Commission covered up the conspiracy in such a gross and clumsy way so as to reveal intentionally the existence of conspiracy.

Make no mistake about it, the Warren Commission and its staff were made up of very able men. If these men had wanted to cover up the conspiracy more effectively they could have done so. As we shall see, the cover-up was accomplished in such a self-defeating fashion that one would have to suspend common sense and respect for evidence in order to accept the Report's conclusions.

I believe that this is a theory deserving to be considered. Marty thinks it is nonsense. I believe that the concept is commonly used by our national security state. You will recall that I gave you an excerpt from the *Philadelphia Inquirer* about the NATO attack on China's Belgrade embassy. I will now repeat verbatim that news column and then endeavor to show you what I think is the transparent effort to reveal that the bombing was not an accident but in fact was a deliberate attack. This will gag Marty, because he feels that the U.S. and China are locked in a perfect conspiratorial embrace.

Associated Press LONDON- British, U.S. and NATO officials yesterday denied a British newspaper report that NATO had deliberately bombed the Chinese Embassy in Belgrade during the Kosovo war after discovering that the embassy was transmitting Yugoslav army communications.

"The tragic mistake was caused by human error," NATO spokesman Jamie Shea said of the May 7 bombing, which left three people dead.

The bombing ranked among the most embarrassing attacks of NATO's 78-day air campaign, which forced the withdrawal of Serb forces from Kosovo, a province of Yugoslavia's Serbia republic. It also caused a major rift between China, the European Union and the United States.

The Observer, a liberal weekly, quoted unidentified military and intelligence sources in the United States and Europe as saying NATO knew in April that the Chinese Embassy in the Yugoslav capital was being used as a "rebroadcast" facility.

After an attack April 23 on President Slobodan Milosevic's residence, Yugoslav radio transmitter signals were silenced for 24 hours. When they came on the air again, NATO electronic intelligence detected the source as the Chinese Embassy compound, the newspaper quoted unidentified officials as saying.

NATO then removed the embassy from a list of prohibited targets, which included embassies, churches and hospitals, the Observer said.

A flight controller operating from Naples, Italy; a Macedonia-based monitor of Yugoslav radio traffic; and a "senior headquarters officer" in Brussels–all unidentified–confirmed the story, the Observer said.

Shea said NATO had heard nothing to change its conclusions since U.S. investigations "made crystal-clear that there was no deliberate attack."

Britain, where Chinese President Jian Zemin is to arrive today for a state visit, also denied the newspaper report.

British Foreign Secretary Robin Cook said he knew of "not a single shred of evidence to support this rather wild story."

"The idea that the United States has been sitting on a good explanation for all these months but sought not to share it is, I'm afraid, a delusion," Cook added in a British Broadcasting Corp. television interview. "It was a tragic error. That is the reality of the situation." Speaking yesterday on CNN's Late Edition, Secretary of State Madeleine K. Albright called the report "balderdash."

"We have spoken to the Chinese about it many times. I have sent delegations there to deal with them. I myself have spoken to the foreign minister. It is simply not true," she said. "Now what the Chinese were doing at that embassy clearly, there is information that they were carrying on intelligence activities, but we in no way–and I want to make this absolutely clear–that the story is wrong."

The Chinese Embassy was also suspected of monitoring U.S. cruise missile attacks to develop countermeasures, the Observer said.

The newspaper speculated that the Chinese may also have been hoping to get technology about the U.S. Stealth bomber from Yugoslavia. The Yugoslavs shot down a Stealth bomber early in the bombing campaign.

The Observer said it conducted an investigation jointly with the Danish newspaper *Politiken*. That newspaper is on strike, but the story was on its Web site.

On the one hand the theory that the Embassy attack was a deliberate attack is "denied": "not a single shred of evidence to support this rather wild story," "delusion," "balderdash," and "simply not true," "…U.S. investigations made crystal clear there was no deliberate attack." That is the denial phase of the Orwellian double think concept. The U.S. investigations are the equivalent of the Warren Report.

Next, you get the official version for those who want to preserve the institutional purity of the U.S. war machine. "The tragic mistake was caused by human error." "Most embarrassing," "tragic error."

Then we are provided with unidentified sources providing us with what may well be the truth, and provide logical motivation for the attack, but if you accept these data without the sources being available to you then you are a conspiracy theorist. These unidentified sources tell us that: "...NATO knew in April that the Chinese Embassy in the Yugoslav capital was being used as a "rebroadcast facility." "Yugoslav radio transmitter signals were silenced for 24 hours. When they came on the air again, NATO electronic intelligence detected the sources as the Chinese Embassy compound..."

But, for those who have to know–the nations of the world who might be inclined to intervene when the U.S. is hammering one of its designated rogue states with its incomparable air power–the transparent nature of the deliberate attack is made absolutely certain.

I contend that here is the transparent truth revealed in the now unveiled fist of the U.S. war machine: Madeline Albright–and I have quoted her exactly as reported in the newspaper–states: "Now what the Chinese were doing at that embassy clearly, there is information that they were carrying on intelligence activities..." Those intelligence activities we know from reading the column had to be conducted through radio transmissions. She tells us that these radio transmissions were traced by NATO to the Chinese Embassy.

Therefore, by indirection she told us that then we know that NATO traced those radio transmissions, and therefore had precise information on the exact location of the Chinese Embassy. And therefore, when a B-2 bomber flew from Missouri to Belgrade to deliver three air to ground missiles into the Embassy, it was privy to the NATO data on the exact location of the Chinese Embassy. The former bad-old-map single-bullet-time explanation was being circuitously rebutted by Albright. In its place Albright is transparently instructing the Chinese government and any other foolhardy government that would contemplate such irresponsible behavior in the future, that countries which

interfere with the U.S. military machine's activities do so at great risk. Madeline Albright is not stupid. She knows what she revealed in her statement. I contend that there was no accidental and stupid revelation of the truth on her part, but rather the U.S. through Albright was taking credit for a retaliatory strike against the Chinese for conducting activity which countered U.S. war needs.

I know what Marty thinks of this kind of analysis. Do I have any real friends out there who can make some sense out of my meanderings?

MM (10/30/99)

Vince, bravo! I agree 100%. An excellent example and analysis.

As I have mentioned before, and I repeat it not out of a sense of competition (Vince is my undisputed leader) or of self-congratulation, but merely to show that the transparency idea can and does arise purely on the basis of the facts, without being derivative of anything or anybody else, I had exactly the same idea back in 1989, before I had even heard of Vince or Tom Katen. This might not prove that we are right, but it goes a long way in that direction, and it does prove that we are perfectly sane, rational, and not alone.

In my fourth letter to Fletch Prouty, I wrote (Dec. 30, 1989):

Something that has struck me while reading Groden/Livingstone and your letters– if the conspiracy is this big, why didn't they do a better job of it? They surely could have done it any number of ways (a pin-prick, a drop in cup of coffee, etc.) and left no traces and no questions. Even a bomb, as with Herrhausen, leaves only the slightest trace, which, if you are right, is false–but the case is already virtually closed. They could have done the same thing with JFK and the others, even afterwards, finding plausible scapegoats and settling the dust. The point is, I wonder if the "carelessness" is deliberate? Do they want us to suspect the worst, and at the same time, want us to know that they can get away with it? What could be a better, and more intimidating, demonstration of absolute power and control?

Later I called this the "Let's let'em know we've got'em by the balls" theory. It is exactly congruent with the Vince/Katen transparency theory. Katen and Vince got there first, obviously, but the fact that exactly the same idea occurred to a relative neophyte like me (I was only three years into the subject of JFK at that point) does show, I think, that the idea is logical and very likely shared by many other people.

MM (10/30/99)

Marty, you ask where the group is headed. I like to think of it as an exploratory expedition. Do you know of any other place where these issues are being discussed at the same level? I don't. Where is this discussion in academia? In art? In political groups? On the Internet? Show me a group where we can talk without having to go back to Day 1, and maybe I'll join them.

There is another group, but none of us has access to it. This is the group of the conspirators themselves. But the Bundys (and Chomskys?) are never going to share their thoughts with us. Does that mean we should not share ours with each other? Are we like them?

As for the transparency theory, it is very important. We are dealing here with a faceless enemy. We need to form as clear a picture as we can of who he is, how he operates, and what his goals are. If the transparency theory is correct, it makes a huge

difference. It is the difference between facing a quite stupid, bungling enemy, as opposed to a highly sophisticated and psychologically astute enemy.

MM (10/31/99)

Re Albright, not too long ago I saw an interview with her on TV when she said at one point, "Well, I think our policy is..." I don't remember what the hell it was. What struck me was the "I think."

MM (11/3/99)

On the question of institutional guilt, John, I'll stick my neck out and try an analogy with the business world, which I know nothing about.

You are the chairman of the board and CEO of a multibillion-dollar firm called United Steaks. You have been elected to this position by thousands of shareholders.

United Steaks has a security department, the Meatballs. Now, sometimes the Meatballs are required to do things that are illegal. Thus the Meatballs have long operated on the principle that sometimes they are to take hints and do things on their own that they know the CEO wants done, but can't afford to admit having ordered done (plausible deniability).

The Meatballs are a black box (compartmentalized). Secrecy is the sine qua zilch of this organization. Not even you can know everything about it, because it is composed of people who have been Meatballs long before you became CEO. You have to take it on faith, like everyone else, that the Meatballs are loyal only to you as CEO, that their real power structure is exactly as the organizational charts show, in short that they are totally in your control.

This works until the Meatballs, having developed exactly the kind of rival and secret power structure their very existence encourages, decide to off YOU.

The Meatballs are powerful enough to prevent any real investigation, and despite a lot of suspicion, are never blamed. Even when somebody comes along and proves that at least some Meatballs were definitely involved in the murder, he and others insist that this does not necessarily mean that the Meatballs as such, as an organization, are guilty of the crime. There is no piece of paper signed by the head Meatballs ordering your murder. It is common knowledge that the principle of plausible deniability applies within the Meatball organization as well as in relation to the CEO, so no one expects there to be such a piece of paper.

Nevertheless, many shareholders insist that the Meatballs, though corrupt, are still redeemable. Others, a very small minority, say the Meatballs are not only totally corrupt but secretly in control of the company, and have been ever since they killed you.

Now, if you could roll over in your grave, as CEO, what would you say? Would you say the following? (I've just made a couple of small substitutions.)

In your last, Vince, you said a court of law would have held United Steaks liable for the illegal acts of its officers and employees in the example I cited. By implication you suggest a hypothetical lawsuit proving officers and employees of the Meatballs participated in my murder ought rightly to hold the Meatballs liable also. I certainly agree completely.

This, however, is different from saying the Meatballs killed me as part of a formal, institutionally authorized operation. It could not, by definition have been a formal operation of the Meatballs, because by law I [had] direct authority over the Meatballs and must authorize the Meatballs' covert actions. Therefore, any operation of such magnitude

conducted without my approval must, perforce, be off-line, unauthorized, or–as some would call it–rogue.

Let's step back a minute. Let us remember here that the reason this issue was raised is because the charge that Newman is an agent, was based at least partly upon Newman's assertion that the Meatballs, institutionally, did not kill me, but rather my murder was engineered by a [wider] conspiracy which included officials–even very highly placed officials–within the Meatballs acting under the cover of their Meatball positions but without official Meatball sanction.

I say Newman has it right. I am willing to accept that you may have a different opinion. I am also willing to accept that Newman may be an agent, for all I know. But I do not accept that his position–as stated–is evidence of such. It is, instead, a rational, wholly tenable point of view. It does no damage at all to the perspective we share. If anything, it adds weight to our position because (a) Newman's analysis is based upon internal Meatball records, and (b) Newman names names and proves–flat out proves incontrovertibly–that they had an inordinate interest in Oswald before the assassination.

I doubt that any of us would say this. Am I wrong?

MM (11/4/99)

John, let's stop the semantics and talk about actions. What would you advise the next CEO of United Steaks to do about the Meatballs? My advice to him would be to "splinter them into a thousand pieces and scatter them to the winds" (JFK).

Of course, that is impossible, because United Steaks today is not the same company you were CEO of. The moment your own Meatballs killed you, they destroyed the company, and in fact themselves. They are no longer the Meatballs defined by company regulations. They are former Meatballs, now the head of state. In fact, United Steaks and the Meatballs only exist in name now. Both are bygone institutions.

But let's change the topic. Today a student, Ilona, read her essay in class about the Kennedy assassination. Ilona has taken a seminar on the Vietnam war from a doctoral student, Matthias, who a few years ago was in my English courses. Matthias takes the Gnome's position. (I helped teach it to him.) Ilona, of course, takes Matthias' position. Thus in talking to Ilona I am talking to a less sophisticated, German version of the Gnome. Small world.

I referred Ilona to my website, and offered to let her read Chomsky's original letters if she wanted to. But I hardly think she will take me up on it. She has it from Matthias, who has it from the Gnome. There will be no changing of the minds here. I almost said "changing of the guards"–but come to think of it, what's the difference?

VS (11/5/99)

In my Dallas speech I stated that the "assassination would have to be considered as the work of the very center of U.S. power." I offered the following proof of this proposition:

Framing of Oswald.

Killing of Oswald.

Oswald's CIA connections.

Acceptance of the Warren Commission without criticism, its secret hearings, and the Report by the ACLU, the U.S. liberals and left.

The impossibility of the single-bullet theory, and its uniform acceptance by U.S. intelligence and the mainstream media.

From the beginning the absolute refusal of any aspect of the U.S. government to act on the evidence of conspiracy which evidence included eyewitness testimony including that of Secret Service agents in the motorcade respecting the source and number of the shots and the nature and location of the wounds.

The immediate marriage of all U.S. governmental institutions, civilian, military, and intelligence to the single-assassin theory without keeping options open to have the government institutions on guard to counter any conspiracy which may have killed JFK and by so doing to protect the legitimacy of the U.S. institutional structure.

The uniform rejection by all institutions of the U.S. government and its media allies of all evidence of a multi-assassin killing which included, inter alia, eyewitness, olfactory, motion picture film, and medical evidence.

U.S. government and media lies about and censorship of the Zapruder film.

Truncation and abortion of the autopsy of President Kennedy's body under the direction of admirals and generals.

Criminal behavior of Warren, Specter, Luce, Rankin and so many others in concealing evidence of high level involvement in the killing and its cover-up.

Failure of the Warren Commission to include in its documents the FBI original and supplemental FBI report which contradicted the Warren Report.

Not drawing the necessary and inescapable conclusions from the positioning of the holes in Kennedy's shirt and suit coat.

Not calling the custom tailor and custom shirt-maker of Kennedy to testify to the impossibility of the bunching of the garments so requisite for the single bullet theory.

Specter instructing the Philadelphia Bar that the people are going to have to rely for their conclusions of the stature of the men of the Commission. With what meaningless remnant of democracy were we left when our government servants were dictating to us that we were to accept on faith their incredible conclusions that were contradicted by the evidence from which those fallacious conclusions were drawn?

J. Lee Rankin's "N.Y. Times" attack on me of January 3, 1965; criminally urging that there was no "credible evidence" to support the conclusion that there were "more than three shots."

Announcement from the Situation Room of the White House on the afternoon of the "rogue killing" that Oswald did it and did it alone before there was any evidence against him and while there was immense evidence of conspiracy.

Ignoring the testimony of Governor and Mrs. Connally about a separate hit on him.

Criminally dry cleaning and pressing Connally's clothing.

Criminally removing the presidential limousine from Dallas and then destroying the evidence of the crime by refitting the limousines.

Commander Humes criminally–and quite obviously under instructions from high military authority–burning the autopsy notes.

Appointment of Allen Dulles to the Commission.

Katzenbach criminally directing Warren to violate his charge as a fact finder.

Mrs. Luce sending Gaeton Fonzi on a wild-goose hunt on government time and money.

Failure to arrest the Paines, who are obvious conspirators.

The connection of the Paines to the highest levels of U.S. Establishment and intelligence.

Who among us doubts that these data and much more available to us demonstrate beyond a question that the assassination was as I have stated "the bloody work of the U.S. military-intelligence system and its supporting civilian power elite"? I have been, since making that Dallas speech, patiently waiting outside criticism of this thesis. None was forthcoming. Who among us is prepared to dispute the conclusion to which I arrived based on the above-mentioned data? In light of the above data what possible meaning can we attribute to a discussion of whether the assassination was institutional or renegade in nature? If you choose to take exception to my conclusion, kindly explain how all of the above data comports with an assassination attributable to less than the highest level of U.S. military-intelligence and Establishment power?

MM (11/6/99)

I think I can say honestly and without contradicting myself that I agree with you, too. You said it before: we are talking distinctions without a difference. Really it boils down to a matter of degree, doesn't it? How many rotten apples are there in the barrel? How do we find them, and prevent the rot from recurring, as we know it does?

I think investigating Posner would be a great idea. Also people like McGeorge Bundy. And Chomsky. And Newman.

However, I do not have the patience for that. Nor would I have the patience to comb through the intelligence "community" and try to weed out the hard core evil-doers from the collaborators, the active and passive collaborators, and extending the same process to the government as a whole, the media, etc.

Not only do I not have the patience for that, I don't think it is a realistic goal. I don't think it is possible. I think that is a losing game. I think that is the game the bad guys would like us to play, because they know they will win.

I believe a more realistic strategy (still far-fetched, but somewhat less so) is to throw out the barrel. Let's call them secrets instead of apples. Throw out the whole damn barrel, and set up a strictly controlled Board of Secrets. This board would decide, but only on the basis of extensive, documented and absolutely convincing argumentation, what can be kept secret and what can't. An example of such a secret would be the directions for making genocidal (and perhaps increasingly selective) viruses like HIV. If we have bombs, of course the codes to send them off have to be secret. Sure, there's probably plenty of stuff like that. But I see no reason why any human being should have to tolerate secrets for which there is no transparent justification.

So if you think you can reform the CIA and the rest of our secret government (cf. Bill Moyers) in that direction, I'm with you.

However, if I thought that were possible, I wouldn't be writing to you but trying to influence some politician or other. I think we all feel this way, and that's why we have found ourselves in this group. We all want to do meaningful work, but it's hard to find. There's plenty to keep us busy, but little that appears meaningful, and even less that appears meaningful to more than one or two or us at a time.

MM (11/7/99)

I agree with you, Joe. A Truth Commission is exactly what we need. But look what it took in South Africa to get one. What we got was the ARRB, [*Assassination Records Review Board, see http://www.fas.org/sgp/advisory/arrb98/index.html. --MDM*]

which was hardly comparable. I don't think truth is in the cards, though, unless the "intelligence" (= stupidity in my book) apparatus is crippled, broken down, and as JFK said scattered to the winds. Every single "institution." The CIA, NSA, etc. have nothing to do with democracy. And we should not forget all the civilian networks of spooks that have grown up as offshoots. The re-built government should have as a primary goal the prevention of all clandestine power structures, within the government and outside it. That's why we have a police force, too. They are supposed to protect us from the Mafia (etc.), not work with them.

I tend to agree with you, too, rather than Ralph, on the relevance of JFK to the Truth Revolution. (An innocuous enough name for a movement–who could be openly against Truth?) It is still, as you say, the clearest case, and because of Vietnam, the most highly charged. How many cases do you need? I have stopped being interested in all of them, myself. There is too much detail. JFK is enough. It's all there, including the denial. All the elements of our continuing predicament. It would certainly be a great shame to accept the conclusion that the JFK case is no longer useful in activist politics. After all the fine work that so many people have done, including members of our group? No!

After all this talk about "institutions" and John Newman, has it occurred to anyone to contact him directly? He is the one who should have been answering our questions, or trying to. Maybe he would turn out to be another Smedley Butler (though I doubt it).

Although that would probably be a waste of time. I think we should start thinking about what we can do as a group. Letter writing, for example. When one of us sends off a letter, we could all sign it. Wouldn't that be worth something? We could try to expand. I have tried to bring us into contact with the Alan Cantwell group, for example. We could contact other groups. I'm sure there are literally hundreds where we could find lots of people that would agree with us. People who are supporting Leonard Peltier, Mumia Jamal and so on. We are not by any means alone in believing that we have to fight the government before we can improve it. Surely this Internet technology is something we can learn to use to our advantage. The whole world is wired now. We could be talking to many more people than just ten.

First we have to get ourselves straightened out, though. We never did this in the paper correspondence. Things are different now. I think we should put pressure on everyone in the group to say exactly where he stands on all the issues ("I don't know" being an allowable answer). We've gone round and round on "institution." We are ready to vote on that.

Why bother? I can hear some of us saying. Does that question really need to be answered?

VS (11/10/99)

John, Mike contends that we are arguing about distinctions without a difference. I do not think that is the case. On the contrary I think that our argument is basic to a true understanding of the meaning of the killing of President John F. Kennedy. I feel that John's conception of the assassination is where the U.S. power structure is heading to seek to exculpate the U.S. national security state from central blame for the assassination and the horrors which followed. I will not enumerate those horrors. We all know them. But I feel particular guilt about our having killed some three to four million persons in Vietnam in a terribly unjust war which JFK had taken steps to wind down.

I believe that the U.S. national security state, which has spent 16 trillion dollars on the Cold War, seeks to cloak itself in innocence. This innocence will enable the national security state to continue to allocate to itself large chunks of the great wealth of this nation for future weapons systems. These weapons systems, whether or not they are effective in killing efficiently the oppressed people of our empire, will serve their primary purpose of providing rich profits for the military industrial complex.

This is why I feel that the difference between the institutional guilt or innocence of the national security state is of major significance in determining whether this planet has a future. With that said, let us take a fast look at how the law views corporate guilt. Certainly John, you are not saying, or are you saying, that in order for the national security state to be guilty of the killing of Kennedy–its titular commander in chief–he would have had to sign off on his own assassination? That is not the way the law views corporate institutional guilt.

In a criminal prosecution of a corporation the corporation is considered criminally liable for the actions of its officers, agents and employees who participate in the criminal activity. The concept of a principal being responsible for the actions of its agents applies. Commonwealth v. J.P. Mascaro and Sons, Inc. 402 A.2d 1050, 266 Pa.Super.8.

An indictment sufficiently alleges an offense against a corporation if it either alleges that corporation acted knowingly or absent such an allegation sets forth facts showing a knowing violation, namely an act done by a corporate agent within the scope of his or her authority and with the intent of benefiting the corporation. U.S. v. LaBar, 521 F.Supp. 203, affirmed 688 F.2d 826, certiorari denied 103 Supreme Court 260. John, you are in agreement that the killing of JFK was designed to benefit the national security state? John, you do agree that agents of the national security state were involved in the killing of Kennedy and its cover?

Now, John, if your view is right, that LBJ, Hoover, Dulles and a few others were involved in a renegade fashion, then, the national security state apparatus and its civilian allies were not, and are not, as I view them, thoroughly corrupt. Then in your view the national security state is not complicit in the killing of the President, nor the criminal cover-up of the killing, and therefore not responsible for the horrors, including the horror of sending you to Vietnam to kill innocent people. In your view, insofar as the people you named are all dead, the Kennedy assassination is no more than a past event in history of no current significance. On the other hand, if my view is correct, then the whole of the national security state in killing Kennedy, and the civilian allies in covering it up, were and are criminal structures that have to be radically reexamined as a danger to all of humankind. In the words of Reverend Joe Stimmins, "...our system needs to get down on its hands and knees and do an awful lot of begging, and make a lot of promises toward change to the Almighty before it receives that redemption."

Now, let us go, John, to your analysis and see whether it holds up to civil inquiry.

You speak to the framing of Oswald, killing of Oswald and Oswald's CIA connections. You concede that the CIA was involved in these three areas. But you see the CIA as being departmentalized so that one hand did not know what its other hand was doing. If that were true, then I believe that on the basis of that analysis alone, we should eliminate that agency. Such an agency is not an intelligence agency, but rather is an anarchy of stupidity. You agree that in Dallas he was probably on loan from the CIA to the FBI. We are in agreement here. I suggest that the reason Oswald was lent to the FBI

was so that the FBI would be like the Soviets, Castro, Communist Party U.S.A., Socialist Workers Party, and the ACLU implicated in the guilt and therefore silenced.

You are sure that Hoover was involved. I do not share that certainty. You tie Hoover in with Henry Luce. Then how do you explain the *Life* magazine full-page editorial that appeared shortly after the issuance of the Warren Report written by Shana Alexander entitled "Time for New Blood" asking for the removal of Hoover from the FBI directorship? Were the renegades of the CIA operating outside the scope of their employment when they sent Lola Belle Holmes to me to destroy me by attempting to bribe me and to have me distribute misinformation to the *New York Times*? Were those renegades operating outside the scope of their authority when they sent Lola Belle Holmes back to me late one night to inform me, as you do now, that Hoover and LBJ were behind the assassination? Was I wrong to direct her to leave my home and to return to and to tell her agency, the CIA, that I knew that the agency had planned the killing and killed Kennedy?

I was so sure that Hoover was not a prime mover in the assassination that I dedicated my March, 1965 articles in *Liberation* as follows:

This article is respectfully dedicated to the three fine men of the secret service, special agents Glen A. Bennett, Clinton L. Hill and Roy H. Kellerman, whose truthfulness and loyalty to their dead chief was unshakable, and to the F.B.I. firearms expert Robert A. Frazier, for his technical contribution to the case.

You feel that "Probably no more than 3 dozen in the CIA" were in on the plot to kill Kennedy. Let us take that improbable number as accurate. We know from Fonzi's work that Bishop-Phillips was involved. He was far up enough in the CIA to be recognized by Senator Schweiker. Thirty six assassins doing occupationally hazardous work constitutes a pretty big chunk of our taxpayers' money to serve the interests of the national security state. In any legal case, that amount of commitment of financial resources to accomplish a criminal purpose would be a lethal finding of fact to convict a corporation of criminal responsibility.

On my point of the "Acceptance of the Warren Commission without criticism, its secret hearings, and the Report by the ACLU, the U.S. liberals and left," you say that these groups "simply did what most people did. They went along. What else were they to do? Start a revolution?" The ACLU just went along? Passively? Why did they actively and privately come after me, a loyal and active volunteer, because I had attacked the Warren Report? Why did they extract a resignation from me thereby stripping me of their institutional protection to which I was entitled by their charter and my membership and hard work on their behalf? Why did they expose me to greater danger by their separating themselves from me? Why had they not fought to provide legal counsel for their member, Lee Harvey Oswald? I suggest that the answer to all of this was debilitating fear, because signals were passed to them that they were to stay out of this. The ACLU, if a bowery bum had been killed in Dallas, would have insisted that an inquest be conducted in Dallas regarding that bum's death, and would have insisted that his/her autopsy not be aborted by generals and admirals. But a President was killed, and one of their members was made a patsy. They saw no civil liberties problem. I, one of their members, had published the first attack in print on the Warren Commission, and they extracted a resignation from me. They just went along? I think, John, their going along had a mighty active quality to it.

What else could the ACLU have done? Why did it not serve its "authorizing document" and protect the U.S. Constitution which had been violated by the removal of the head of state by gunfire by, as you urge, mere renegades? Why did it not turn its back on Oswald and me, their members, and not instead feast on those renegades?

You state that only the youth and not the left challenged the assassination? At 35 years of age I was a trifle long of tooth to have been considered a youth. My father-in-law helped to finance I.F. Stone. With a friend as generous as my father-in-law, I.F. Stone never had to fear about feeding his family. Was his "enfeeblement" the reason why his sharp brain could see the Warren Report as above reproach, and why he saw the critics as belonging in a booby hatch? I suggest that Izzy Stone was scared.

You stated that the public did not have the tools to criticize the official conclusions. What tools did the public need to conclude, as every public opinion poll showed, that the public believed that there was a conspiracy to kill Kennedy? What special tools did I–who had never fired a gun in my life–need? Weren't' the myriad items of evidence set forth in the U.S. press and in the Warren Report clearly enough for the public and for me to demolish the conclusions of the Report? Essentially every reporter who came to me early on introduced himself, and then immediately told me that he considered the Report to be a load of stuff. But not one of them, except for Gaeton Fonzi, ever put his feelings into print. They were lot more fearful for their physical health and their careers than assassination by renegades operating against the interests of U.S. institutional power would warrant.

Are you, John, doubting that a finger of guilt was pointed at the left by the plotters? The patsy had connections with the Soviets, Fair Play for Cuba, the Communist Party, the Trotskyites, and the ACLU. Does this selection of a patsy not speak to a high-level U.S. intelligence manufacture of this leftist octopus and his careful selection as a patsy? If renegades were involved, would they not be risking being crushed by an angry institution which was so badly used by them in their selection of one of their agents to do their ultra vires work?

John, I don't believe that you have answered my point on "The impossibility of the single-bullet theory, and its uniform acceptance by U.S. intelligence and the mainstream media." I would appreciate your addressing this point, since it points to criminal obstruction of justice by all of the U.S. intelligence and all of the mainstream media. Such criminality would not tend to be practiced in the service of renegades.

You stated: "There is no evidence to support the notion that more than two of the murder plotters played critical roles in the cover-up. But these were the men at the top." Two? Why two? At the top? At the top of what? The national security state? Then, if that is the case, you have confirmed in accordance with the law an institutional killing and cover-up.

If you make LBJ a player, then as Vice President of the United States who benefited by becoming President, you have admitted that this "renegade" assassination, according to the law, involved the civilian aspects of the government as well as the national security state. May I suggest that your renegade scenario is getting to be heavy–institutionally heavy?

You say that only Dulles, Hoover and Johnson had foreknowledge of the murder. Why then did the U.S. press, unfettered by an institutional killing, fail to take after the

renegades when the evidence of conspiracy was so clear from the reports of the Secret Service agents on the scene?

You ask me to believe that these one, two or three persons had command of the resources necessary to assign a crew of people to Dealey Plaza on the assassination day and to authorize them to kill the President in a crossfire, and then to have a group parade around in violation of the criminal law as Secret Service Agents? Who had the power to assign three expert marksmen and their back-up teams? Who had the resources to change the motorcade route? Who had the resources to have Dan Rather report that he had seen the President snapping forward after a head hit or hits when in fact he had been snapped leftward and backward? Did the CIA have the necessary resources? Did the CIA have the covert capacity to control all of the above marshaling of operational killing power and have it joined with a propagandizing CIA asset-ridden media to cover for the killers? It did!

You say that you don't know why Warren went along. But you opine that he would only have broken into tears about having been assigned the cover-up role because "Johnson had something big on him and let him know how hardball is played." Do you have so little respect for Earl Warren that you cannot conceive of him crying about the butchers of Kennedy having destroyed the Constitution of the United States? Do you have so little respect for him that you see him putting himself in the service of those renegade butchers to save himself from some private embarrassment? What kind of liberal do you believe he was? What kind of liberal are you to propose such low motives to this great liberal, to the other Warren Commissioners, to the Warren Commission staff, and to all the liberals in the U.S. press who remained silent while the U.S public and the rest of the world were of the opinion that a conspiracy had done away with the beloved President?

You state that Luce was a "life-long, ardent right-wing fascist." Then why was he crying out for the removal of Hoover from office after the Warren Report? If Hoover were involved, as you urge, then why did F.B.I. Frazier's ballistic work demolish the Report? Why did the FBI original and supplemental reports effectively and conclusively counter the Warren Commission's findings?

You state that Luce "...probably didn't know who did what in the assassination." Then you say that Luce knew how to play his part as propagandist. Not knowing for whom he was doing it, his *Life* magazine lied about the Zapruder film's content, censored it, and switched plates in the post Warren Report issue to cover up the right front head shot? Is that not a heavy amount of responsibility for a powerful man such as Luce to have assumed gratis for some unknown renegades?

You then go on: "Why did Specter concoct the single bullet theory? To ingratiate himself and prove his mettle as a team player. He knew the outcome the big boys wanted." You say that Specter "did not know then or know now who was really behind the assassination." And this Yale graduate and prosecutor continues even today to be questioned and ridiculed for his single-bullet fantasy, but courageously and criminally continues to shoulder the blame for covering up for persons unknown to him and for a team which he cannot identify, never feeling free to express even a slight doubt about the truthfulness of his patent and criminal lies uttered in their interest?

You state that Cronkite and the rest of the media lied to support their families. Why would Cronkite and all of the rest of the mainstream media worry about supporting

their families now that LBJ, Dulles and Hoover are dead and their memories are in disfavor? Why would not any of the journalists not gather up all the work done in destroying the Warren Report and run with it all the way to the bank with the money that their Pulitzer Prize journalism would garner them?

You ask us to believe that Cronkite kept quiet because he knew that "One overt challenge to the official party line of the powers that be and..." But you are saying the killers became "the powers that be." Then are we not finally in a most perfect agreement?

I do not believe that you have answered my question about "The immediate marriage of all U.S. governmental institutions, civilian, military, and intelligence to the single-assassin theory without keeping options open to have the government institutions on guard to counter any conspiracy which may have killed JFK and by so doing preserve the option of protecting the legitimacy of the U.S. institutional structure." You state that the Pentagon was a "bystander" in issuing the Situation Room statement that Oswald was the sole assassin while there was overwhelming evidence of conspiracy, and while Dallas D.A. Wade was announcing that there was a conspiracy. T.H. White advised me that the Situation Room announcement came from a military relay station in the Midwest. It was not an announcement from Hoover. It came directly from the heart of U.S. intelligence and the military.

You next ask what evidence there was of conspiracy prior to the issuance of the Warren Report? Were not the newspapers full of evidence to anyone who could read and wanted to understand what she was reading? Did I and most of the rest of the nation not know there was a conspiracy when Oswald was killed? Was I rich when I bought the 26 volumes of the Warren Commission for $75.00? Did I need those 26 volumes to destroy Specter with a few questions drawn from the Warren Report before the 26 volumes were made available? Why is it that the "evidence that made it to the mainstream during the first 20 years was all sanitized, still-frame, hard to decipher, *Life* magazine type, Warren Report type pabulum" if L.B.J., Dulles and Hoover were the only major conspirators, and had conspired against the interests of the U.S. power structure? Why is the mighty U.S. free press still silent now that those three are all dead? Whom would the media now offend by showing the real evidence?

I don't think that you answered why the U.S. government and media lied about and censored the Zapruder film.

You concede that there were admirals and generals responsible for the truncation and abortion of the autopsy of President Kennedy's body. You admit that Connally's clothing was criminally dry cleaned and pressed. You admit that Commander Humes criminally and quite obviously under instructions from high military authority criminally burned the autopsy notes. You admit that key players in the Dallas Police were involved. You admit that Cabell's brother and persons in the Pentagon had to have been a part of the main conspiracy. You admit that plans to handle the evidence of the autopsy surely were made in advance. The doctors, you say, were selected because they would do what they were told. This, of course, means that they were selected to obstruct justice. John, I am afraid that your renegade conspiracy has gotten extremely broad. I submit, under the law, you have institutionally indicted the U.S. press, the Dallas police, the new President, U.S. intelligence, the Dallas police and the mighty Mafia.

So, John, according to you some key players in the Dallas Police, the Pentagon, the selectors of the autopsy doctors, the autopsy doctors, and senior people in the autopsy

room who included admirals and generals, were involved in the conspiracy. All of the people you name were, were they not, servants, agents and employees of the institutions wherein they were employed? All of them, were, were they not, operating under the color of institutional service? All of them were being paid by their institutions to perform the duties they were performing? Therefore, were they not deemed under the law to be operating within the scope of their employment? And therefore, under the law were their institutions as principals not legally responsible for the actions of their servants, agents and employees? Is that not what Professor Keedy taught me at the University of Pennsylvania Law School?

John, you have in my judgment not explained why the Warren Commission failed to include in its documents the FBI original and supplemental reports. You have not answered why the necessary and inescapable conclusions were not drawn from the positioning of the holes in Kennedy's shirt and suit coat. You have not explained why the custom tailor and custom shirt maker of Kennedy were not called to testify. You have failed to answer why the Paines, who are obvious conspirators, were not criminally charged. You have not explained how the Paines, who are attached to the highest levels of U.S. Establishment and intelligence, would have served the interests of the likes of L.B.J., Hoover, and a Dulles gone renegade.

You have not explained why Specter would instruct the Philadelphia Bar that the people were going to have to rely for their conclusions on the stature of the men of the Commission. You have not answered my question as to what meaningless remnant of democracy were we left when our government servants were dictating to us that we were to accept on faith their incredible conclusions that were contradicted by the evidence from which those fallacious conclusions were drawn.

You don't answer why J. Lee Rankin on January 3, 1965 attacked my January 1965 article in *Liberation* by saying that there was no "credible evidence" to support the conclusion there were "more than three shots."

Again, your blaming the Situation Room announcement on Hoover won't wash. The Situation Room announcement came not as you suggest from Hoover but rather from a Pentagon relay station in the Midwest. Please answer the question. Also, answer the question of why McGeorge Bundy, who was in charge of the Situation Room, was doing the dirty work of LBJ, Hoover and Dulles and opposing the interests of the Eastern Establishment which he served and which had an interest in maintaining its legitimacy.

You comment about the ignoring of the testimony of Governor and Mrs. Connally about a separate hit on him, by stating that they back-tracked and soft-peddled their statements. Where? When? You state that they and the Kennedy family acted to protect their careers and their families. Does that fear of death for people in high places such as the rich, powerful, and famous Kennedy family not speak to an assassination any lower than the assassins having achieved the status as new rulers, or as you suggest, having become the new "powers that be"?

From Allen Dulles being appointed to the Commission and Katzenbach criminally directing Warren to violate his charge as a fact finder you conclude that Cabell and probably two of the Joint Chiefs were also involved in the assassination. Is not your rogue assassination conspiracy terribly crowded with high-level institutional personnel who under the law perforce bind their institutions?

If, as you say, Hoover's job was to oversee personally and to misdirect the investigation, then how come his reports were in direct contradiction of the Warren Report?

You, like Newman, see the "boys at Langley" as being victimized by the renegades. Is it more likely that the CIA was victimizing and running the "renegades," or was it more likely that the powerful CIA was being victimized and run by the "renegades?" Will you, like Newman, keep looking for a paper trail which has been in possession of the national security state for over thirty-five years to instruct you as to who the few bad guys were who operated on their own to bring down a beloved president and to change his foreign policy so that the butchering of Dealey Plaza could be repeated millions of times around the globe? Will you, like Newman, observe with solemn respect that the documents which will be upturned demonstrate that Bobby Kennedy's special CIA unit designed to do in Castro turned around and did in his brother? John Thomas, I know that you won't, because Newman is a government agent, and you are not.

Is there any difference between your view of the assassination and mine? Yes, a life and death difference. When the assassination occurred, I was teaching social studies at John Bartram High School. On November 25, 1963 I went before my classes and told them that I thought the CIA had killed President Kennedy. I told them that Vietnam would grow into a large scale war. I told them that they should not go to Vietnam. Some of those students have come to me and told me that I saved their lives with this teaching.

MM (11/11/99)

Vince, you have taught me another valuable lesson. I was willing to suspend principle for the sake of agreement with John. That was wrong.

MM (11/14/99)

John, at the 1994 COPA conference, you and I were sitting next to each other listening to John Newman talk about his research on Oswald's 201 file, later published as a book. When he ventured to predict that this research might well lead to some renegades in the CIA, but that it would not implicate the institution as such, I remarked to you, "How does he know?" I don't remember your response, if you had one.

A few days later I wrote the letter to Newman that prompted you to write to him in my "defense." I don't have that letter any more, but as I remember it, you were asking him to answer my letter because I was an ok type and–this I remember vividly–"we" could use him (me) on "our" side. I wondered a little about that at the time, for two reasons. First, because you were what my father would call "real" military, as opposed to people like Newman who spend their military careers in offices. This is of course where all the important intelligence officers sit–in offices. Secondly, you were a disaffected combat veteran (threw away your medals, joined VVAW, etc.), so you would have even less reason to feel solidarity with a career intelligence officer.

I was a little disappointed in that, because although you were supporting me, you were still excluding me from you (plural), meaning, I concluded, the inviolable brotherhood of men in uniform. Well, I am used to that, having been the black sheep in a very military family, so I took it for what it was worth. Ok, I'll never be one of "you." But I was still quite pleased, because here was one of "you," namely you, defending me to one of your own as someone who was ok enough to actually be considered one of your own. Furthermore, I told myself, John is just exaggerating that in order to coax Newman

into opening up. He doesn't really mean it. Actually, he feels more like it is me and him that are "we," rather than him and Newman.

Well, the strategy didn't work. Newman never opened up, and I doubt that he ever will. That is why I agree with Vince that he is an agent. Not only that, I think he is a TRANSPARENT agent. I expressed this in my letter to him, although I was more polite about it: I said, in effect, "Some people might think such and such of you for such and such reasons. Can you please help us trust you by answering these questions?"

This polite request was answered with total silence, despite your urging. I don't think it was because he didn't have time. This is not the kind of letter (especially since I made it public) that one ignores, unless one has a damn good reason to ignore it. What could those reasons have been? The most likely reason is that he is an agent.

You will have to agree that this is not an insult. If all US government institutions are legitimate and "good," including NSA and CIA, then it is perfectly legitimate and good that one should work for those institutions. Nor do I intend it as an insult. I am expressing a reasonable (and obvious) suspicion.

Now, here we are five years later, and you are not trying to get Newman to listen to me/us, but trying to get me/us to listen to Newman. You are defending, tooth and nail, Phase 4 of the cover-up.

I am not saying you are an agent. I am not clairvoyant. However, I would like to repeat the observation above: if you were an agent, there would be nothing whatever wrong with that because you would be a faithful soldier in the service of a legitimate and good agency of the legitimate and good federal government.

I don't think you are an agent, John. I am trying to show you that your reasoning is deeply flawed. I think you will be angered by this insinuation that you are an agent, as all of us would be. This anger should show you what you really feel about the spook agencies, and perhaps about the government as a whole. This anger is in diametrical opposition to your defense of them. The anger is what you share with us.

If your anger doesn't show you this, it's because there is another, opposite force. The other force pulling at you is not reason. I could go into your letter in detail and try to demonstrate this. But beyond that, we should try to identify what that force is. I believe I know what it is, because I used to feel it. Let's call it patriotism. Patriotism is not reason. That's why I can analyze your letter from now until doomsday, and you will never admit, on the basis of reason alone, that your argument is unreasonable. What you are feeling, what is driving you, is pure emotion–patriotism–and you are trying to make it reasonable, but it simply isn't.

This is the way I see it, John. You are torn between two very powerful forces: anger (what you feel when somebody calls you an agent) and patriotism (what you feel when somebody calls you an American). That is why I tried to agree with you after your last letter, although both you and Vince know that I don't, since you both read my Oct. 1994 letter to Newman.

In one of your previous letters (I'm not going to fish it out now) you seemed to be giving in to what Vince was trying to get you to accept–that it was an institutional killing–but you were obviously quite peeved and upset at being "forced" into it. You felt that Vince and the rest of us were not listening to you closely enough, that we were stubbornly refusing to see what for you was a very clear and simple distinction. But you were–reluctantly and angrily–willing to accept our point of view. This was Anger

winning out over Patriotism, and the anger you were expressing in your letter was anger that probably would eventually have been re-directed to its proper target (US government institutions). But after that letter, it appears that Patriotism came back strong and took control again.

I know you will think this is a ridiculous oversimplification. But I have been there. Have you? I'm talking about the true loss of patriotism. The state of mind of not being proud of being an American, and in fact being ashamed of being an American. The state of saying, "No, I will not fight for this country." I called this Ground Zero.

Now, I'm not saying I'm there all the time. It can be quite a depressing place. It is a depressing place. It is inhabited by people like Vince, Marty, Ralph, and me (I haven't heard enough from the others to tell). Our message to the world is not encouraging. I believe you are there, too, but with only one foot on the ground. (In the grave, part of you is saying.) The other foot is trying to lift off with that patriotic balloon. I don't think it's going to work. I think you will be better off if you let that balloon go, as we have. It won't hold us anymore. None of us are lightweights anymore. At least here you will be among friends. That's why our group exists.

Our situations are very similar. Once upon a time we were clean-cut kids and patriots. Then came the war. I became a disaffected patriot in time to avoid direct participation, you didn't, but you ended up in the same position after you were freed from the military machine.

Then came JFK. For you it was the Stone movie, in 1991. That's what you told me in Washington. It blew your mind. I understood that, because exactly that had happened to me when I saw the Turner film on TV on Nov. 30, 1988. It was a very dramatic and emotional experience, getting my head turned around like that in the course of a single evening. I think it must be similar to the experience of combat. I mean, what happens to that force of patriotism inside us when a friend's head gets blown open right in front of us? That's patriotism? Patriotism is worth that?

Well, in my case it was JFK's head, but more than that it was all the evidence of complicity by the government and (even worse) the press, which made it unavoidably clear that I was looking at a real enemy.

Now, I assumed when you told me how JFK had turned your head around, I assumed you had had the same experience I had had with the Turner film. But I think I assumed too much. Once you have the feeling that you are facing a real enemy, I don't think you will ever find yourself defending that enemy in any way, shape or form. But there you are defending him. Yes, certainly you are defending the enemy, from my point of view, by pronouncing the CIA and the US government innocent of the crimes of what you insist on calling a "rogue element." From your point of view, since you do not see them as the enemy, you are simply defending innocent institutions from unreasonable and unwarranted attack.

You obviously do not see the US government in general as your enemy, nor the CIA, NSA, or any of the other secret police and military agencies, except perhaps the FBI and ONI (the latter because Oswald was in the Marines, I guess). You have been at pains to remind us of the good things the government has done, that there has been progress. It doesn't faze you when I say that Nazi apologists say the same thing about Hitler (built great roads, etc.), because for you there is no comparison. Nazis were and are Nazis, and Americans are Americans, and the twain never meet. All comparisons between the Nazi

government of Germany and the US government post 1963, between the SS and our military intelligence, the Gestapo and our CIA, are invalid by definition, because Nazis are bad and "we" (Americans) are good.

I submit that this is the problem at its core: Is the current US government, as it operates today and has since (at least) Nov. 22, 1963, our common enemy, or not?

I don't think you can possibly say yes to this, and still defend the integrity of institutions like the CIA: therefore, you must not see the government as the enemy.

Joe can tell you that there are many Vietnam vets who disagree with you, and do see the government as their enemy. There are plenty of Gulf War vets who also feel this way. They have many good reasons. Plenty of Black Americans, and other minority Americans, feel this way. Plenty of people on the left, and plenty of people on the right. Millions. I don't think I have to tell you about the millions more outside the US who share the view that the US government is their worst enemy.

It is this enemy, this colossal enemy, for millions upon millions of people (and many millions more who are dead), that you are defending, when you defend the legitimacy and innocence of its most nefarious institution, the CIA.

It is short-sighted of you not to realize that no one who sees the US government as the enemy can accept the distinction as you are making between institutions and rogues. You only accept it yourself, I am suggesting, because of patriotism–not logic (as I will try to show later). As I keep saying over and over, as to Newman, if it were the KGB you wouldn't tolerate such distinctions, if it were the Gestapo you wouldn't either, etc., etc.

You are a patriot, John. That force is still driving you. Since I know that force, and I know what it is like when it leaves you, I feel that in a way I know you better than you know yourself. I have been to where you are, but you haven't been to where I am. You won't accept this, of course. You can't. No amount of reasoning on anybody's part is going to make you change your sense of patriotism. I don't think the Stone film did that to you, after all. Or if it did, you have managed to overcome it.

This has been clear for a while, I guess, but after your last letter I decided there was no use in pursuing it. Better a disaffected patriot than a gung-ho patriot. I mean, I compare you with all the other ex-military people I know, and I think, wow, he actually agrees that it was a conspiracy, that the government was in on it, etc. But Vince is right. Being a disaffected patriot is not enough. Can you be a disaffected Nazi?

Therefore, having identified patriotism as the driving force behind your arguments, I will turn the tables on you. From now on I will argue with you on strictly patriotic grounds. Now, I'm far from an expert in American history and the Constitution, but I probably learned more or less the same things growing up that you did about what America was supposed to be.

I will settle the "institution" argument in one fell swoop: The CIA and all the "intelligence" agencies, in short, the national security state, are anti-democratic, un-American, and unconstitutional entities. They are therefore enemies of the state, which is supposed to be a constitutional democracy, and they should all be abolished.

If you assume that "the country" or "America" or "democracy" would thereby also be destroyed, then we have fundamentally different understandings of those concepts.

Perhaps you would like to argue that the CIA is not anti-democratic, un-American, and unconstitutional. Please go ahead. Try it. I will demolish you, and have plenty of help doing it. I don't think there are many people in the CIA itself who would

defend it against any of these charges. It is, as Gen. Smith said, a bucket of shit. Please try to argue with us that the CIA is not a bucket of shit. First you should convince Gen. Smith, one of the founders of the agency.

John, I think this takes care of it for now. I may go over your letter and point out your errors of reasoning, and specifically how your analogies are false, but as I said I don't think it will lead anywhere. I have the feeling we are arguing at one level below the level where our real differences lie. I would rather have you tell me why you think it is necessary or desirable to tolerate anti-democratic, un-American, unconstitutional institutions, institutionalized conspiracies, in fact, like the CIA, in our American constitutional democracy. As a 100% American patriot, I submit that I am doing more to uphold American constitutional democracy by demanding the immediate abolishment of all secret government agencies, starting with the CIA, than you are by insisting that they are innocent and capable of reform. I say these agencies are by their very nature anti-American, anti-democratic, and anti-constitutional.

MM (11/23/99)

Joe, what you report about the Feb. 1994 organizing meeting of COPA is interesting. I didn't know Scott and Hoch were friends.

The first person to approach me at the COPA meeting in 1996, the first night I was there, was Paul Hoch. He stuck some clipping about the Bay of Pigs in my hand. He knew what I was going to talk about and he came prepared. When he left me as abruptly as he had approached me, and later when I read the article, which was so uninteresting I have no recollection of it at all, I wondered why he had given it to me.

One other person's behavior puzzled me at that conference. About two seconds after I met Gary, who struck me as the kind of person it is impossible not to like, I met the dapper Prof. Scott, English professor, poet, and ex-Canadian diplomat. I knew that much from cover jackets. His only words to me were: "I've been wondering what you DO" (with extra stress on the "do," as if to imply that there was some sort of mystery about it). I said I did the same thing he did, which was teaching English. I had to practically shout this at him, though, since he was already about 10 yards away and moving fast. This question, and the way he said it, was dripping with suspicion.

The next time I had a chance to talk with Scott was in the bookshop that had been set up in the hotel. About 20 seconds after I joined this group of I think it was three, Scott hurried away saying something about "saving his voice."

Ok, I am not the most personable guy in the world, but this is unusual behavior in my experience. Hoch was prepared, and Scott was, too. He was clearly negatively disposed toward me. Where did that come from?

I knew that Scott and Chomsky were acquainted, and by then my quarrel with the latter was clear, so that is a possibility. On the other hand, I had agreed (in my correspondence with Chomsky) with Scott's analysis of the withdrawal thesis that he published in the Gravel Pentagon Papers that Chomsky edited. I had expected that Scott and I would get along ok, since we seemed to agree on the issue.

This, Joe, plus your account of his refusal to acknowledge the most elementary criticism of the Warren Report for the puzzling reason of not wanting to "embarrass" his friend, gives me serious pause.

Chomsky is just too damn smart to believe the things he says about the assassination and the withdrawal plan. Similarly, if you read what Scott has written, you

know that he is far too intelligent and sophisticated re the assassination (much more than Chomsky) not to know that the Magic Bullet is a fairy tale.

Chomsky's letters to me, you may recall, ended with the quite hysterical accusation that I was an agent (this was his reaction to my letter to Newman). Now, what would an agent most likely shout at someone who is threatening his cover?

Look how careful I was with Chomsky, what work I had to put into trying to communicate with him before I drew any conclusions. Chomsky had no trouble calling me an agent, merely on the basis of my letter to Newman. Either that or he meant, like Parenti, that my queries to Newman were totally uncalled for.

If Scott's obviously negative predisposition towards me came from Chomsky, it came before I even wrote that letter to Newman, and before Chomsky wrote his reply.

Let me remind the group that Scott, along with Gary, is among those members of the COPA board who never responded to my letter to Newman.

VS (11/24/99)

John, what you see as our democracy I see as a plutocratic empire. In this respect, our differences are, as Marty demonstrates, not inconsequential but rather constitute an abyss.

Considering how I have personally benefited from living in this country, and considering how rich a life I have enjoyed, I consummately hope that my vision of our society is wrong. But the truth supported by the plain evidence tells me with a high degree of certainty that your perception about our society is flawed by a chauvinism which I at a hidden level harbor and desperately want to embrace. But my peasant origins prevail. I will stand intellectually, along with Marty, with the underprivileged of our world who suffer from the greed of our empire.

MM (11/28/99)

John, you want a "major overhaul" of the CIA, and then you say it should be "taken down" (yours of 11/26). Which is it? Reform or removal? This is what we have been talking about all along, you know. This is the entire source of your quarrel with Marty and Vince (and me).

You accuse Vince unfairly of inciting us to non-action. I have ACTED by creating a petition of grievances (still in improvised form) and signing it. Vince has ACTED, by signing part of it. Owen has ACTED. No one else has–either because they do not understand the purpose or mechanism of the ACTION or because they do not agree with the statements or don't give a flying fuck.

I submit the following: the correspondence group is society in microcosm. Your attitude is typical. We have adopted the mentality of our rulers. We think big. We think, to have an "impact" we must think big, and do big, with big money, big numbers of people, big institutions, and big media coverage. That is what we think because that is how Big Brother rules us. We see ourselves in His image.

The logic of this is beautiful. Once we have adopted this mentality, we cannot do a fucking thing. We are totally helpless, forever, because we will never, ever have the various bignesses required to overturn these same bignesses on their own territory. Therefore, by insisting on big ("real") action, big money efforts, etc., you are insisting on failure.

Vince, however, is willing to say what he thinks and sign his name on the dotted line. So am I. Does it require big money, etc. to get someone to sign his name to a

statement he agrees with? No, it doesn't, or if it does, it means that there is absolutely no hope left at all. When the same people who refuse to sign also refuse to explain why they refuse to sign, and when these same people think that they are "enlightened" and have a better understanding of political reality than other people, then the situation is not only hopeless but ludicrous.

VS (11/29/99)

Marty considers my last post as confusing. Allow me to explain. On 11/28/99 John Thomas wrote to Marty stating that he did not agree at all with Marty's views, but that he was able to accept them as the legitimate position of another intelligent human being. I viewed John's statement as the end of the debate among us. We finally understood one another. I have already set forth that I agree with Marty's view of the meaning of the assassination. Indeed, I feel that I held his view before he claimed it as his.

In my post earlier today, I spoke of John's intelligence as being superior to mine. I truly believe it is. I have expressed to you many times that I consider each of you as more intelligent than I am. I was not meaning to suggest that I have suddenly converted and agree with John that the U.S. oligarchic empire is benign. My views are the same as they were the day that Oswald was dispatched. The killing of Kennedy, I will always believe was the work of the highest elements of our National Security State, i.e. it was a Cold War killing. I believe that the neo-liberal globilization process is a continuation of the Cold War by somewhat other means.

I expressed love for John. This is sincere. I thanked him for stimulating my tired old thinking processes. This is sincere. He is the only person to take me on in debate on the killing of JFK. I found his challenge to be beneficial to my thinking. For that I owed him, and expressed to him my thanks. Is it not clear that he did not persuade me to his point of view? Is it not clear that I refuse to hate him for not sharing my point of view?

Marty feels that I owe you, the group, an apology. If I confused you, I apologize for my inept explication. The confusion was a function of my difficulty with clear articulation and was not by design.

MM (12/4/99)

Yes, Joe, I think we can call it the "Fuck You" theory as well as the "transparency theory," because that is exactly the message.

Re the "Petition," the refusal of 6 out of 11 members of this group to participate is interesting. I said it would separate the wheat from the chaff and it has. I think everyone has gotten the message by now, so it is clear that their refusal is deliberate, and not because they are slow in answering their e-mail, etc. There's nothing like drawing a line in the sand to find out where your real friends are.

This is the closest this group has come to any kind of common action in six years of letter-writing. And look at the response! It is interesting (as well as disappointing and maddening), because as I've said before, the group is a microcosm of the society as a whole. Despite our view of ourselves as "enlightened," the majority of this group behave (as opposed to talk) no differently than the vast majority of the rest of the population, and probably for as many different reasons. We haven't heard from them all, but that, too (silence), is typical of the population at large.

Still, there are a few of us who not only see that the emperor is naked but are willing to say so, plainly and publicly. I have succeeded in ferreting out those few people within this group, and if we apply it on a larger scale, I still think it would be constructive, don't you?

VS (12/6/99)

Mike, I understand your disappointment about the failure of all members of the group to participate in your poll. However, I feel that in a democratic setting we should not require that citizens of our tiny cyberspace community do anything that they do not wish to do. For what they do I feel that we can and should hold them strictly accountable. For what they do not do, we should respect their privacy. I feel that we should live with the variation of the golden rule which states that we should not do unto others what we would not have others do unto us.

Suppose that I should ask some persons to do something political which they would otherwise feel inclined to do except for the fact that they dislike me because they feel I am a Marxist, or an anarchist, or a fanatic with whom they do not want to be associated. If I were one of them, I would not wish to be required to give my reason for not participating in the political effort. Therefore, I would not require of them that they specify the reasons why they would not support my political effort.

With respect to our group of e-mail correspondents and our former snail-mail correspondents I feel each of them has value to me and is needed by me. We are a tiny community. On the subject of the JFK killing each of you has far more in common with my thinking than I have with my darling wife. None of my personal friends outside of this group shares my views on this subject. In this area of my life, you are all I have.

Therefore, I very much wish that you can show one another the respect which you show to me. I suspect that some of you are displacing your disappointment with me by expressing anger with one another. If such is the case, then you are affording me undue privilege and unfairly treating the targets who are unconscious surrogates for me.

What you share with one another in our joint endeavor are good intelligence, ability and willingness to analyze data and draw reasonable inferences from those data. You are able to undertake this work although there is no apparent political, monetary or societal benefits which will grow out of these efforts. These are the only prerequisites for inclusion in this group. There is no requirement that we must be lovable and perfectly balanced human beings. You are willing to have me in this group, and to afford me respect and even love. I can attest with certainty to my enormous failings as a human being. Justice would appear to require that you treat one another with something like the kindness you show me. If you have good feeling for me, then please understand that I feel wounded when you personally rip one another. I have viciously attacked some of your ideas, but I have rarely attacked you personally. Those that I have seen fit to ridicule, such as Ralph Brown, know that these attacks are made in my and your certainty that you understand the depth of my true appreciation of you. Each of you have a good and loving holiday season.

MM (12/11/99)

Thanks to Joe for passing on the news about the MLK verdict and to Gary for the AP article. I have been trying to collect all the articles I can on it since, and I have about 27 now. I want to comb through them to get a better idea of exactly what has been pinned on Uncle Sam, because that is obviously the biggest news.

And I agree, Joe, that it is big news, great news. One of the articles said it was being played down in the mainstream press (of course), but that the black community radio talks shows are buzzing with it. I wish I could tune in to some of those from here. I get very little input from "the folks" (black, white, or otherwise) here. I miss that.

I have posited five phases of the cover-up:

Phase 1: The Commies did it.

Phase 2: Oswald did it.

Phase 3: The Mafia (+ anti-Castro Cubans) did it.

Phase 4: Rogue CIA agents (+FBI + Mafia + Cubans) did it.

Phase 5: The CIA (+ their allies in the rest of the government and society at large) did it.

Phase 5 is the truth, but we need to add a sixth phase, which is:

Phase 6: It doesn't matter.

This is the phase we can see now with the truth emerging about MLK. The same will happen, eventually, with JFK (and RFK, etc.). I think we need to study this carefully, and see if there is anything we can do about it. This is the stage at the end of the story of the emperor's new clothes, to wit:

But he has nothing on at all," said a little child at last. "Good heavens! Listen to the voice of an innocent child," said the father, and one whispered to the other what the child had said. "But he has nothing on at all," cried at last the whole people. That made a deep impression upon the emperor, for it seemed to him that they were right; but he thought to himself, "Now I must bear up to the end." And the chamberlains walked with still greater dignity, as if they carried the train which did not exist. THE END

I love this story. It fits our situation so exactly.

One more point, about the Gnome. He said somewhere that he didn't think the MLK killing had any more "political significance" than JFK. The murder of Fred Hampton is the only one he acknowledges as "possibly" having political significance. I want to know what he says about this latest development. If you hear anything (e.g. on ZNet), please let me know. I suspect he'll wriggle and squirm and end up implying he knew it all the time, and will do the same (if he's still alive) when the JFK comes out in a similar way. This is part of Phase Six, too: those who deny and obstruct the truth the most will be precisely those who will try to embrace it as their very own personal property, as soon as it becomes obvious that they must.

MM (12/12/99)

I have now collected 34 articles on the Jowers verdict, which are mostly redundant. I've checked out CNN, NYT, *Washington Post*, Yahoo, and *LA Times*. There was nothing on ZNet or misc.activism.progressive (a newsgroup). I haven't done a search with Alta Vista, etc., because I know it will take days to check out the results, but I will pursue it when I can.

There must be websites out there buzzing with this news, but I haven't found them yet. There are millions of black Americans who hate the criminal U.S. government as much as we do, and I'm sure many of them are online. But where? Maybe it would be more effective to look for them through Pepper, Jesse Jackson, or Rep. John Lewis of Georgia.

I wonder if there is any way to access the material actually presented at the trial, if it is different from what is in Pepper's book (ordered). [*See*

http://www.thekingcenter.org/news/trial.html. --MDM] If it convinced the jurors it should convince others.

I notice that our friend Agent Posner is on duty again, claiming the trial was a farce.

Of course Big Bill won't do anything. He's too busy getting his dick sucked in the White House while 11-year-old boys are dragged away in chains, jailed, and brought before a judge for helping their little sisters to pee. Dexter King is quoted in one of the articles as saying the obvious, which is that the government is not going to indict itself.

This, Gary, was and is the basic fallacy of efforts like COPA. I said this in my speech in 1996: The government is never going to indict itself, no matter how much paper we get them to throw at us. Stone is apparently making another movie, this one on King. Will that spark a revival of COPA? If it is just to lobby for document releases, forget it.

What COPA should have been, and perhaps still could be, is a nexus for like-minded people who know that all they have to rely on is themselves. As I've said, that is also the motive behind my "petition" idea. The technology is there. If we do not take advantage of it, we have only ourselves to blame. I have no patience or understanding whatsoever with those who prefer to keep their heads in the sand. The Internet is a real ray of hope, a gift, which the government and its commercial allies will do their best to take away from us.

If one thing should be clear, it is that there are no top-down solutions. Meaningful reform will have to go the other way. Unlike the JFK case, we know that there are millions of (black) people in America who still care about MLK. There are millions who care about AIDS. The challenge is to reach and activate them. It is technically possible, but it is not easy.

Look how difficult it is even to get the 11 supposedly enlightened people in this group to state their opinions! Unlike Vince, I have no understanding, no respect, and certainly no love for the cowards in this group who refused to respond to my petition or even to explain why they refused. Vince, with friends like these, you don't need enemies.

Joe, I would like to think you're right about Germans, but I'm afraid the fact is that people are the same everywhere. The Germans lost the war; that's why they are contrite. But it's only skin deep, and not even that sometimes. There is plenty of murder, corruption, and cover-ups here, all of which go on parallel to the official genuflections concerning the Holocaust. I am reading a book now about the RAF that supports my theory of the Herrhausen murder.

MM (12/13/99)

I would like to ask the members of this Elite Group if they know any black people. (The only ones I know are Africans.)

If you do, I would like to know if they (or you) can refer me to any websites or newsgroups that are interested in pursuing the Memphis Jowers judgment in some meaningful way.

Today I informed one of my classes that MLK was the greatest American whoever lived, and that he was murdered by the United States government.

I am certain that most or all of you will think I went too far. I am also certain that every single one of you (like me) is lily white.

I rest my case.

VS (12/16/99)

Mike, I have good friends who are black. They are good and loving people. After the Memphis verdict they have asked me who killed Martin Luther King and why. I have given them our assessment. I think they knew it, and that they shared our view, before they asked. But they have absolutely no interest in pursuing it. Their careers would be hurt if not ended by such a pursuit.

I don't know whether MLK was, as you informed your class, the greatest American who ever lived. But in my judgment he is up there somewhere near the top. I totally agree with you that the United States government killed MLK. I would only add that they did it one year after he announced his opposition to our Vietnam invasion. So, his killing, like JFK's, was as I see it a Cold War killing by our national security state.

MM (12/18/99)

Owen, since Prouty hasn't answered my letter, I am wondering about his health.

I am also wondering about two other things. I have already asked him (I think it was through you) how he knew at the time (Nov. 89) that Herrhausen was not liked in "The City." That was the basis of his immediate suspicions, which he passed on to me, and which I then put into my article (*Lies of Our Times*, 1990). Prouty did a radio talk show on the topic, but I don't believe he wrote anything. (What was the name of that talk show? Do you know?)

The second question is, did he mention my name and article to the German journalist(s) that talked to him? The reason I'm wondering is that I am reading a book I have just discovered, a book called *Das RAF-Phantom* by Gerhard Wisnewski, Wolfgang Langraeber, and Ekkehard Sieker that elaborates on my thesis that Herrhausen was done in by his fellow bankers. This book was published in Dec. 92 and revised in Oct. 97. In the 97 edition, at least, Prouty is mentioned in the Herrhausen chapter, but there is no mention of my article. I have contacted Wisnewski by e-mail, and he says he never heard of me. I referred him to my website and told him that Prouty had a copy of my 1990 article from the beginning, and that I would be surprised if Prouty hadn't mentioned it, especially since he has a copy of it on his website. Wisnewski said he would take a look at my website and get back to me. I'll be waiting.

The book is excellent, but I'm pissed off that I was ignored. I still believe I was the first person to promulgate that thesis, and in fact I can prove it.

Wisnewski et al. actually go further than I did, implicating the German secret police agencies, and they do a convincing job of it. Still, I'm disappointed that I wasn't given my due. This is not the way to do research.

Wisnewski implies that Prouty is LaRouche connected. What is your opinion on that, Owen?

MM (12/18/99)

Thanks to Owen Rogers, I have a copy of the summary arguments in the Jowers trial, which concludes as follows:

THE COURT: All right, ladies and gentlemen. Let me ask you, do all of you agree with this verdict?

THE JURY: Yes (In unison).

THE COURT: In answer to the question did Loyd Jowers participate in a conspiracy to do harm to Dr. Martin Luther King, your answer is yes. Do you also find that others, including governmental agencies, were parties to this conspiracy as alleged

by the defendant? Your answer to that one is also yes. And the total amount of damages you find for the plaintiffs entitled to is one hundred dollars. Is that your verdict?

THE JURY: Yes (In unison).

MM (12/21/99)

Joe, I would add to what you have said, which is all true, that the MLK verdict also shows the bankruptcy of our legal system in a pretty transparent way.

Here we have the truth–again, as with O.J.–coming out of a civil court, which all the articles describe as less reliable than a criminal court, requiring less rigorous proof ("preponderance of evidence" vs. "beyond reasonable doubt") for conviction. I don't know if this is true or not, and would be interested in Vince's take on it.

If it is true, then justice has been reversed: the higher you go in the system, the less justice (or truth). Since the system is built on the reverse hierarchy, the situation now clearly demonstrates the ass-backwardness–hence bankruptcy–of the system.

This, as I keep saying, is also what Jay Leno tells us every night, in his attacks on lawyers, and his O.J. and Clinton jokes. (Clinton is still the chief executor of the legal system; I think Leno's message to us–from NBC–is that the presidency and the legal system are both hopelessly corrupt.) I don't think he could have done this twenty years ago. We are being prepared for a new system, I think, and I don't think it will be long in coming. It will come just like the fall of the Soviet Union. We won't know what hit us, and we won't care, or will take it as "progress." They have even given us the name–the New World Order. That is, the Brave New World Order.

I don't think the Orwellian echo of the phrase is unintended, either. We have another transparent message here, for those willing to receive it: It is 1984 + 16.

There is a transparency about the MLK verdict, too. It tells us that truth, even if confirmed by a "lower" court, will not prevail (i.e., at the "higher" levels). It may exist, and even be confirmed in a "low-level" courtroom–but it cannot have an impact.

So, Big Brother is saying, you see what you get with your assassination research, and calls for further investigation and trials? You now know the truth. Where does it get you? Nowhere.

This is the same path we will eventually be led down in the JFK case. Suppose this was the JFK case, instead of MLK. Suppose the same verdict were reached? It will happen someday. And the difference between what is NOT happening now and what will NOT happen when it becomes JFK will be very small, if any.

MLK was more important, I think, to more people than JFK was. If this verdict doesn't have them out on the streets again, as in 68, the future truthful verdict in JFK's case will have even less impact.

This depresses us, of course. But why should it depress us any more than black Americans, or any other oppressed people, should be with the view of reality they have every day? (I think racism is still alive and well enough to justify the word "oppression," which can be emotional and intellectual as well as physical.) Maybe it doesn't. I don't know. I find it an interesting question.

MM (12/22/99)

Owen, this Wisnewski character hasn't reported back. He was going to check out my Herrhausen article. If he writes back and expresses genuine surprise, that he never

saw his own letter (or my article) on the Prouty website, and that he never did a Lexis/Nexis or other search for articles on Herrhausen, and that he talked to Prouty but Prouty never mentioned my name, then I guess I should believe him. If he doesn't, a lot of young German university students are going to hear bad things about him and his book.

Sorry to hear of Fletch's deteriorating condition. I guess he wouldn't be able to remember who put him on to Herrhausen, then.

I don't think I'll hear from Wisnewski again, either.

So it goes.

MM (12/27/99)

Vince, I was discussing the MLK verdict tonight with my nephew, who is a lawyer. The question is, what would the state have to prove in a criminal case that the plaintiff did not have to prove in the MLK trial?

The news articles repeat this over and over, without explaining it, e.g.:

A civil court jury finding a defendant like Jowers at fault relies on a standard of a preponderance of evidence. In a criminal case, a defendant must be found guilty beyond a reasonable doubt.

In a civil suit–brought by an individual plaintiff or group of plaintiffs instead of the state–the plaintiffs must merely show "a preponderance of evidence" against the defendant, rather than prove "beyond a reasonable doubt" that a crime was committed, as in a criminal trial.

Suppose it had been a criminal trial. How would this have affected the evaluation of the evidence of a conspiracy involving the federal government? How do they draw the line between "preponderance" and "beyond a reasonable doubt"–and who makes that decision? What do they do, count witnesses?

Is the standard of evidence that must be adduced to cause one party to hand over millions or billions of dollars (these would be civil suits too, right?) to another less than that required to convict an ordinary criminal of participating in a murder? I find that pretty hard to believe.

This is one argument that is being used to defuse the impact of the MLK verdict. The other one is that the Jowers side didn't argue hard enough because there was only $100 at stake, and he had virtually agreed to plead guilty from the beginning. This doesn't strike me as a valid argument, either. You might as well admit that justice in all cases is directly proportional to the amount of damages at stake. I can't believe that many jurists would agree with that.

In other words, I'm trying to pin down just what it is, if anything, that makes a civil trial verdict less worthy of respect than a criminal trial verdict. As we saw in O.J. Simpson's case, the opposite can be true–since my impression is that most people assume he is guilty (in fact if not bylaw).

And what about transparency here, Vince? It's clear what the King family is telling us. What is Big Brother's message, do you think? I think there must be one, because I don't see how the trial could have occurred at all without Big Brother's consent. I'm sure the state could have found someway to prevent it, if they had really wanted to. Otherwise there would have been a lot of trials before this, probably, in all the assassination cases. What's your opinion?

VS (12/28/99)

This difference between the burden of proof in a civil case and a criminal case is preponderance vs. proof beyond a reasonable doubt. The jury decides in both cases, if the judge does not decide the case preliminary and the matter reaches the jury. A preponderance of evidence is more than 50%. To warrant conviction in a criminal case the facts and circumstances must be such as to reach not necessarily a moral certainty of the accused's guilt but at least beyond a reasonable doubt. A reasonable doubt is one that could be entertained by a reasonable person. A reasonable person's doubt is whatever the jury chooses to accept as reasonable.

I do not believe that the U.S. government was much concerned about interdicting the MLK-Jowers case. Jowers, I believe, was a side-show equivalent to the Mafia theory in the JFK killing. The U.S. media are dealing with the MLK verdict as a limited-hang-out situation. This tends to disprove that Ray was the assassin, just as the Mafia-Rogue-CIA hypothesis disproves the Warren Report and the lone assassin concept. Both concepts shift the focus from the Cold War meaning of these assassinations. The historical truth is that the U.S. government killed MLK because he had turned against the Vietnam war and was seeking to join the civil rights movement with the anti-war movement. The historical truth is that the U.S. government killed JFK because he was seeking to accommodate to the Soviets, Castro and seeking to pull out of Vietnam. The Jowers-Mafia-CIA rogue explanations are efforts to explain these historically monumentally significant Cold War killings as having no relevancy to the U.S. warfare state and the empire it was protecting.

In the case of JFK one cannot get a better idea of how such dishonest work is done by Warren Commission critics than the work of Warren Hinckle and William Turner in their *Deadly Secrets–The CIA-MAFIA War Against Castro and the Assassination of J.F.K.* The book concludes on pages 418-419 with the following:

The early 1990s saw a burst of Kennedy revisionism, and renewed questioning of the orthodox explanations of the Kennedy assassination, prompted by Oliver Stone's great agitprop movie *JFK*. The movie has readdressed the question of whether Kennedy was set in his counterinsurgency ways on Vietnam or if, as John M. Newman argues in his 1991 book *JFK and Vietnam: Deception Intrigue and the Struggle for Power*, he really planned to leave but for political purposes tried to also make it look like he would stay. The authors believe both Kennedy brothers were men of murderous determination and would not have left Vietnam, or Cuba, alone–but if one takes the revisionists at the best of their argument, Kennedy was running two tracks on Vietnam, and his assassins killed him because they thought he would pull out. In this context, the assassination of John F. Kennedy is one of the greatest ironies, and greatest tragedies, of American history.

As the thirtieth anniversary of the JFK assassination nears, a few players left alive who have knowledge of what actually happened are surfacing. Each new revelation confirms the authors' thesis when we began this book back in the 1970s–that JFK was killed by the CIA-mob Castro assassination plotters run amok. In January of 1992 a particularly poignant revelation was made by attorney Frank Ragano, the longtime confidant and lawyer for both Jimmie Hoffa and Carlo Marcello, Ragano was interviewed by Jack Newfield in the New York Post.

Ragano is a man given great respect by Mafia expert Nick Pileggi, who says the lawyer was the messenger for many years between Hoffa and Marcello–making

unnecessary, dangerous face-to-face meetings. Pileggi says Ragano is a man who really knows the secrets.

Ragano said that early in 1963 he carried a message from Hoffa to Marcello and Santos Trafficante. Hoffa's instructions were: "Tell Marcello and Trafficante that they had to kill the president. This has to be done.

Two weeks after the assassination, Ragano met in New Orleans with Carlos Marcello, who he said looked like the proverbial cat that swallowed the canary. The mobster was a happy camper. "Jimmie owes me and he owes me big," Marcello told the lawyer.

Ragano also told Newfield about this death-bed visit in Tampa in1987 to the dying Castro assassination plotter for the CIA, Santos Trafficante. The fading don rambled on philosophically about the epochal events of his criminal life.

He had only one regret: the assassination of the president. Killing Jack Kennedy had been a mistake. Trafficante told the lawyer, because it had brought too much pain on Jackie and the rest of the Kennedy family–for that matter, on the entire nation.

"We should have killed Bobby," said the dying don.

Warren Hinckle followed this up with the book entitled *If You Have a Lemon, Make Lemonade–An Essential Memoir of a Lunatic Decade*. He wrote a chapter in this book entitled: "Give Us This Day Our Paranoia–THE JOLLY GREEN GIANT" (p. 197-198) The chapter begins:

PARANOIA is a little like dogshit. One you step in it, you can never be sure it is not still with you. You try to scrape it off your shoe and walk on, looking back frequently to see if you are leaving any tracks, continually sniffing the air around your own person so as to be doubly sure, pitting one sense competitively against another, challenging the nose to be sensitive to what the eye cannot see...You pretend–or really believe–it matters not which, as the result is the same–that the dog-do isn't there, you press on, generally creating a stink, and giving the impression of being some sort of a nut.

That last was the way the District Attorney of New Orleans, Jim Garrison, handled his paranoia.

Garrison began talking when I picked up the mailroom extension:

This is risky, but I have little choice. It is imperative that I get this information you now. Important new evidence has surfaced. Those Texas oilmen do not appear to be involved in President Kennedy's murder in the way we first thought. It was the Military-Industrial Complex that put up the money for the assassination...

The chapter tells how Turner collaborates with Hinckle at *Ramparts* and how Turner is in charge of the JFK investigation there. Hinckle makes short work of the Warren Report on page 205-6:

...the function of the Warren Commission was not to ferret out the truth, but to put the citizens at ease that there was no conspiracy... The Warren Report's chiropractic explanation of how a lone gunman did it was violative of the laws of physics, probability, forensic pathology, Aristotelian logic and Newton's second law of motion...

Pages 206 and 207 gives a biographical sketch which much praises Bill Turner. In pages 210-212 Hinckle seeks to destroy the fine reputation of Ralph Schoenman, Joan Mellen's former husband, with whom she still retains a warm friendship. Here is what Hinckle has to say about Ralph:

For every stridulous Batman there looms a sibilant Robin. Mark Lane's congener and rival for star billing was Ralph Schoenman, who surfaced in the assassination business as volunteer head of the London office of Lane's "Citizens Committee of Inquiry." There is scarcely a left-wing cause the doorway of which Schoenman has not darkened. He was possessed of a rabbit energy which reminded me of the line of John Barrymore's in Gene Fowler's grand biography of the actor, when Barrymore talks about the rain that "beats with the persistence of an unpaid madam at our door." Schoenman was an indefatigable meddler, a whirling dervish in three-quarter time, a salute without a flag; he circled the globe hundreds of times during the sixties, establishing a reputation as a sort of Red Baron of international unpopular causes. Schoenman was Bertrand Russell's confidential secretary during Russell's last years, and proved a vexatious cross for the great man. The last thing Russell wrote in his life was a personal white paper dissociating himself from many of his aide's statements and activities in his behalf; he had it published posthumously, presumably so that Schoenman could not follow him to the grave. Ralph's capacity to sire dislike was greater than that of any person I have known; Sartre was said to gargle after speaking with him.

Schoenman thrust himself into the Warren Commission controversy in 1965 by bursting through the door of the apartment of Edward Jay Epstein, then a quiet Cornell graduate student hard at work on his uncomplimentary study of the piecemeal procedures of the Warren Commission which was later to receive notoriety as the book *Inquest*. Epstein had found the FBI report of the Kennedy autopsy that contradicted the Warren Report's lone assassin thesis buried among the hundreds of miles of Kennedy Assassination papers in the National Archives. [This is not likely, since I was the first one to publish in *Minority of One* "The Separate Connally Shot" on the FBI report which I got in the National Archives. Even Jacob Cohen conceded to me that *Inquest* was cribbed from my articles.] Schoenman, falsely identifying himself to Epstein as an English publisher, dashed in and demanded a copy of the hot FBI report. Epstein refused, and Schoenman began rummaging through desk drawers, almost pushing the stuffing out of the pillows, and generally behaving as if he were a Florida hurricane just blown in the door. Epstein said he had to yell police to get Schoenman to leave.

Such a stormy visitation from the Radical Opposition must have had a traumatic effect on the cautious and refined graduate student. Epstein, once he could sleep nights without having nightmares about Schoenman, finished writing his book... Epstein advanced to a new calling, staked on his credentials as a "reasonable" critic of the Warren Commission, the *New Yorker*'s resident debunker of unkempt enemies of the Liberal Establishment. His targets, to date, have been as diverse as District Attorney Jim Garrison...

So, you get the idea. Garrison and Schoenman are paranoiacs. Turner and Epstein are quiet and refined. To disbelieve the Warren Report is fine, provided you do not know that the National Security State killed JFK and MLK in the interests of the U.S. empire. Should you know about the bloody work of the National Security State, then you are at best irrational, but more probably a paranoiac.

VS (12/29/99)

After having opened up the Bill Turner problem to truth seeking, let us now turn our attention to John Newman. I excerpt from the above-named work the following. Please comment as I hope you will comment on the Turner material. I think that the work

we are doing in explaining that the job of truth-telling in the JFK matter is not to attack the Warren Report. Rather, our task is to define the historical role of the killing of JFK by the National Security State, and the concealment by its civilian allies of the true purpose of the killing in order for the National Security State to consolidate and perpetuate its autonomous power. This power extends over our foreign policy and enables this apparatus to distribute annually approximately 300 billion dollars to the military-industrial-complex.

Here follow a number of pages of quotes from Newman's Oswald and the CIA. *These were incorporated in a book review that Vince revised several times, the final version appearing in his letter of 1/31/2000.*

Dr. Aguilar, you presented a brilliant destruction of the Warren Report on 9/13/99 to *The Nation* staff. John Newman also presented there. Did he pay any attention to your clear and irrefutable presentation? How can he now argue that Dealey Plaza is a "puzzle?" How can he maintain that he "lacks the requisite skills in ballistics, forensic pathology, photo and imagery interpretation, and criminal psychology, to name but a few." How can he argue that "We need fewer studies that claim to have all the answers and more that focus on specific areas and are built on firm robust evidentiary foundations"? What was wrong with the robustness of your evidentiary foundations?

Gary, may I suggest to you that *The Nation* staff knows what happened. They are merely fumbling around trying to determine in what manner they may make themselves politically useful when the Warren Report has no further value as political currency.

Mike, you wanted an example of the transparent conspiracy? Can you find a better one than the Newman material quoted above?

Again, please comment on Turner and Newman. In my judgment, this is where more useful work can be done for those of us who are willing to value historical truth more than political opportunism. I submit that our dedication to the historical truth in the JFK assassination, is as far from nihilism as one can get because it is moral. That dedication serves to condemn and reduce in power those institutions which have threatened, and in the future unless exposed, will continue to threaten the survival of humankind. Love of truth is not incompatible with love of humanity. Rather, I submit that the two are inextricably joined.

MM (12/30/99)

To return to the question I asked you in my last letter, Vince, I would like to know your opinion as an attorney concerning what, if anything, would have been different in the evaluation of the following evidence if the Jowers case had been a criminal rather than a civil one. If this had been a criminal trial, what, if anything, would have prevented the jury from coming to the same conclusions on the basis of this evidence?

This is a crucial question. We are talking about the credibility of the evidence that the U.S. government participated in the conspiracy to murder MLK. If they "participated," then they are obviously the primary guilty party, since they are also the most responsible party (or whatever the legal term is in corporate law that you quoted to us in the discussion about rogue vs. institutional guilt). Why do you wish to discuss Turner and Newman in the face of this surprising and unique opportunity to demonstrate the guilt of the U.S. government in the MLK case? Pepper does not argue that MLK was a mob killing, but that it was a mob killing condoned and supported by the U.S. government.

This is much better than trying to sniff out agents like Newman and Turner, who are just continuing Robert Blakey's work by adding in a few government "rogues" to add a smidgen more verisimilitude to the big lie. We have the big lie by the tail in the Memphis trial. Why do you want to swat flies when you've got the dragon by the tail?

The Jowers case is not a side show, and the fact that you say so puzzles me. Have you not read the news articles, which say the jury found the federal government was involved in the conspiracy to murder MLK? The federal government, Vince–not the Mafia, and not "rogue elements" of the government.

You say further that because Jowers is a "side show," you "do not believe that the U.S. government was much concerned about interdicting the MLK-Jowers case."

That was in answer to my question about transparency. I had suggested to you that the guilt of the federal government is so transparent in the Jowers/MLK case (i.e., explicit and confirmed by a jury and a judge) that this same federal government, having the power that it does, would never have allowed it to take place unless it wanted this be so. You use the word "interdicting," which sounds like a legal term to me. Do you mean there would have been a legal or defensible way for the federal government to prevent this trial, or prevent the evidence of it's own complicity in the murder? That would of course support my argument that they chose not to intervene, although they could have. (I was thinking more along the lines of covert manipulation.)

I fail to understand how you can think that the US government would not be much concerned about a trial revealing that a revered popular leader was killed in a conspiracy in which it participated (and would therefore have to be the primary party responsible). On the contrary, the fact that they must have been (and must remain) extremely concerned supports my argument that they allowed the trial to happen, and to come to those conclusions, on purpose. That purpose was to send us the same message they sent us in Dallas: that they've got us by the balls. "Yes, it's true. We killed King. We killed Kennedy. We did it for the reasons documented and confirmed in a court of law in Memphis. SO WHAT!"

This was also the message to the Chinese (and the rest of the world) when they bombed the embassy in Belgrade, as you astutely argued.

This was also the message of the Stone film *JFK*, and will no doubt also be the final message of the one he is apparently doing now on MLK.

But this time, Vince, the message comes from inside a courtroom, and from a jury, which makes a big difference, if we even a scrap of faith left in the U.S. legal system. The King family obviously retain this much faith, or they wouldn't have bothered. They are also telling us quite clearly with their acceptance of this verdict as "final," that they know that pursuing the truth and justice beyond this level is too hopeless or dangerous for them to do. That is their message to us, and it is also the government's message to us, because the government has allowed it to be conveyed, in all propriety. Of course the King family would pursue the case, and would have pursued it much earlier, if they thought they had a chance. This was the one chance the government gave them to get at least some satisfaction, and as it turned out the wishes of the family and the federal government in the end coincide in the message that I have just described. The difference is that the King family I am certain is immensely sad about the message, whereas the federal government is happy to have another opportunity to make us aware of and accept our place.

All of this I find much more interesting and significant than Turner and Newman. As I said, why swat flies when you've got the dragon by the tail?

VS (12/30/99)

What is the transparent message that Turner and Newman are sending? Turner has not been involved in transparent work. Rather, his role has been, as I have set forth above, to strip the Kennedy assassination of its tremendous importance as a successful U.S. institutional effort of the national security state to take over the foreign-policy-making functions of the state and to perpetuate and expand the Cold War by destroying Kennedy's work to accommodate to the Soviets, Cuba and to extricate us from Vietnam.

With respect to the Jowers case, the U.S. national security state was not a party to that litigation. I know that the U.S. national security state killed MLK. I know the reason for the killing, i.e., as part of the Cold War effort to prevent King from coalescing the civil rights movement with the anti-war movement. But, as a lawyer, I could not say that the Memphis trial convicted the U.S. national security state of any crimes. Since the national security state and its agents, were not defendants and in no way were parties to the litigation, they could not be deemed civilly or criminally responsible for the killing. If any national security state agents had been made parties to the litigation, you can bet that the government would have found many ways to screw up the trial. The U.S. media's response to all of this is found in *U.S. News and World Report*, December 20, 1999 (sent to me by Joe Stimmins).

The Shelby County district attorney's office, long at odds with the King family, was absent, as was an ailing Jowers, 73, who was described by David J. Garrow, the Pulitzer Prize-winning King biographer, as "an ostensible defendant...who for over six years now has been going out of his way to plead guilty...Says Garrow, "We don't know who precisely aided and abetted Ray. But anyone who doesn't accept Ray as the gunman is from Roswell, N.M."

In a racist United States, with the civil rights movement much diminished in size and strength, with the anti-war movement tiny, with the society divided racially, with no government agent having been a party to the case, the U.S. government did not and does not presently appear to be in much danger from the Jowers trial result.

Is there a transparent aspect to the trial? Since the King family, and not the national security state filed the suit, I cannot conceive how the U.S. government was involved in a transparent conspiracy in conducting a trial over which they had no role nor control.

You ask if this were a criminal trial, would anything have prevented the jury from coming to the same conclusions on the basis of this evidence? In a criminal trial the national security state's agents would have to be declared defendants. They would be able to cross-examine the prosecuting witnesses. They would be able to introduce rebuttal witnesses. They would be able to avail themselves of the rules of evidence which exclude all kinds of valuable material for countless subtle legal reasons. They would seek by evidence, and argument to seek to instill in a jury member a reasonable doubt of guilt. If any individual juror entertained any reasonable doubt and persisted in holding on to that doubt, then there would be a hung jury and a mistrial. If all the jurors entertained a reasonable doubt, then there would be an acquittal.

Although there is no mention of "rogue elements" of the government, the conclusion that Jowers participated in the conspiracy is the only finding that the jury

made which is binding on anyone. Jowers is the only defendant. The other agencies found by the jury to be involved, the U.S. government, the FBI, the Memphis Police Department, and others, were not parties to the litigation.

Mike, try to get John Thomas to admit that this litigation proves institutional involvement of the national security state. I will not be able to make an effective argument to him that such is the case. I assign you to the task.

There was no way in which the U.S. government could have prevented this case from being filed and tried. In the case of Jim Garrison, he indicted and tried a U.S. intelligence agent, Clay Shaw. The government infiltrated Garrison's office. Stole his trial plans. Sent in phony witnesses such as Charles Spiesel. Surrounded Garrison with U.S. disinformation specialists who fed him poison. Bill Turner joined with Bill Boxley, the "ex" CIA agent to prepare a memorandum which would have, if it had been acted upon, made Garrison the laughing stock of the world. The U.S. national security state got state governments to refuse to cooperate with Garrison. The U.S. government refused to assist Garrison in any way possible. The media thumped on Jim without mercy. If the Jowers case were a criminal case, and if U.S. national security agents were joined as defendants, all of the above tactics would have been employed. The criminal court room is the last place you would expect justice to be done when our powerful national security state institutions are at risk. You could not indict these institutions unless they lost a war and were made defendants before an international tribunal of the winners of the war. In such a case, I am certain they would plead the same defense which the Nazi Nuremberg defendants pleaded. The Nazi defendants at Nuremberg argued that only individuals can commit crimes. The state, they contended, as an institution could not commit a crime.

So, you don't think the Turner and Newman material is of any interest to you. Well, my friend, you are entitled to your opinion. I happen to feel that there are works presently in progress which are seeking to incorporate the data of the assassination and conclude therefrom that the institutional guilt of the national security state in the Cold War context is crazy, and that only a rouge element concept is rational. I feel that this is where the national security state is going with all of its assassinations, JFK,MLK, John Kennedy and Malcolm X. All of these assassinations are one ball of wax. Just so long as they are attributable to rogue elements, the legitimacy of the U.S. warfare state apparatus remains intact and free to stuff its deep pockets with U.S. taxpayers' money–free to make U.S. foreign policy through the use of its spanking new weapons systems.

The Turners and Newmans are honored by the critical community, and their works are treated as above criticism. Almost no media account of the JFK data goes without a comment from Newman, who is afforded celebrity status by our whoring media. Yet, you deem them as flies not worth swatting. With this view I take sharp issue.

VS (12/30/99)

Mike, I have not answered your inquiry about Newman. I was hoping that rather than seeing him as a fly you would have addressed your fine intelligence to the question of what he is telling us transparently.

In an effort to bore you and to share with the group what I think he is saying I set forth what I feel he is about. Please read this along with the actual verbatim quotes from Newman's *Oswald and the CIA* in my 10:35AM 12/29/99 post.

Here follows the first draft of Vince's remarks on Newman's Oswald and the CIA which became the book review included in (see) his letter of 1/31/2000.

Mike, I think I have answered all of your questions. Will you please forgive me for my penchant to swat flies.

2000

MM (1/1/2000)

I don't think that what is legally binding or necessary for conviction is at issue here. What is at issue is the correctness of the facts that are adduced as evidence. As I understand it, if those facts are adduced as evidence in a civil trial, they may add up to a "preponderance of evidence" sufficient for conviction, though they might not add up to the "beyond a reasonable doubt" criterion for conviction in a criminal trial. This, however, does not mean that the facts are any less correct in a civil trial than in criminal trial.

In this case, we have both sides adducing evidence to support a conclusion of fact, namely that there was a conspiracy to kill King and that the U.S. government was involved. I don't know what the legal term is, but there must be one for this kind of factual conclusion, which both sides accept as true and correct. At some point, conclusions can become facts, and that is what I mean.

I'm sure you'll be able to think of much better analogies than I can, but consider these two cases:

Case 1 (criminal): Elvira shoots her husband, Alphonse, because she is afraid he will beat her to death. Elvira needs to show that Alphonse was a bully and had a right to feel terrified. She adduces evidence to establish this fact (witnesses to beatings, etc.). The prosecution does not challenge this evidence because it is in their interest to establish this fact as well. They want to show that Alphonse was always a bully and that therefore Elvira knew what to expect from him, and can't claim any special circumstances for reacting as she did on that one fatal occasion. In fact, the prosecution adduces further evidence that Alphonse was a bully.

Case 2 (civil): Ellsbeth, Alphonse's old crippled mother, sues Elvira for damages, having been deprived of her sole means of support, her son Alphonse (she was the only soft spot in his heart). Again, both sides assert and accept the fact that Alphonse was a bully, and that that was why she shot him, but here the question is how high the damages should be, not the degree of premeditation.

As I (am beginning to) see it, the difference between "preponderance" and "beyond a reasonable doubt" comes into play in the final judgment, but not in the evaluation of each piece of evidence. There is no question in either case that Alphonse was a bully. This is established as fact. Evidence was presented which were accepted as facts, and the conclusion based on these facts, namely that Alphonse was a bully, is then also accepted as fact. This is what I was calling a factual conclusion, for lack of the proper term.

The analogy to the fact that Alphonse was a bully is the fact that the U.S. government was involved in a conspiracy to kill MLK. In the Jowers case, this was established as a fact by both sides, the jury, and the judge. It was not a matter of "preponderance" vs. "beyond reasonable doubt." That difference would apply to the question of whether and how much damages should be paid, or to the question of whether

or not Jowers should go to jail, but it does not apply to the question of the correctness of the facts in the case, because there is no such question. What was established as facts in the case remain facts. You can't take a distinction that applies to further interpretations or conclusions based on established facts, and apply it, retroactively, to the facts themselves. The participation of the U.S. in a conspiracy to kill MLK is one of these facts in the Jowers case, just as the fact that Alphonse was a bully is one in my hypothetical example.

All I have is the summary arguments, so I can't repeat all the details of the evidence, but from Pepper's summary it seems clear that the following facts were established.

1. Members of the 111th Military Intelligence Group based at Ft. McPherson in Atlanta, Georgia, were in Memphis on the day MLK was killed. Witness: Eli Arkin of the Memphis Police Department Intelligence Bureau, Intelligence Division.

2. The members of this Army Intelligence team had MLK under covert surveillance. Witness: Eli Arkin?

3. MLK's motel room was bugged at the Rivermont Motel on the 17th or 18th (of July?) by members of the Army Security Agency. Witness: One of the three members of the surveillance team.

4. There were two photographers on the roof of a fire station (in view of the Lorraine Motel balcony?) taking pictures throughout the day when MLK was shot. The existence of these photographs has never been acknowledged, although the names of the two photographers are known and it is known that they were part of a psychological operations team (of what agency?). Witness: Capt. Weiden of the Memphis Fire Department.

5. An eight-man sniper unit of the 20th Special Forces Group was in Memphis on the day MLK was shot. They were assigned to and trained for a mission there. The mission was aborted. Witness: 1) The best friend (a long-standing covert operative of the U.S. government) of a member of the sniper team. 2) Documents (?) relating to another member of the sniper team who left the U.S. in the 1970's.

6. The U.S. government, as well as the Memphis Police Department and others, were involved in a conspiracy to kill MLK. Witness: Reports, exhibits, and testimony given by Mr. Garrison, counsel for the defendant.

These were all facts, summed up in 6, that amounted to a preponderance of evidence–not to prove 6, since that has already been accepted as fact–but to prove that Jowers was part of 6 and that the amount of damages is appropriate.

The difference in a criminal trial would be that all of these facts, summed up in 6, might or might not erase all reasonable doubt in the jurors' minds–not about 6, since that has already been accepted as fact–but about, say, whether or not Jowers himself was the trigger man.

The facts in both cases would be the same, and of equal validity, reliability, truthfulness, correctness. It is thus wrong to imply, as the newspaper reports do, that the facts in the case, including the one that the U.S. government conspired to murder King, are any less correct than if it had been a criminal trial.

We are talking here about facts, not legally binding adjudications. Facts can be established as true without them having any legally binding consequences. That is obviously what has happened in this case, just as it happened in O.J.'s civil trial (I think, though I didn't follow it). The fact that he killed the two people was established, so there

was an adjudication on damages. But this established fact could not be used to overturn or re-do the adjudication in the criminal trial.

Obviously, the U.S. government is not going to allow the equivalent of an O.J. criminal trial (inadvisable politically, although they would probably win it by hook or crook, as O.J. did). They have, however, quite transparently, just after the 30-year statute of limitations on murder ran out, allowed the civil trial and thus allowed the establishment of the fact of their own guilt. The establishment of that fact, however, does not have legal consequences for them.

And that is the real point. Here is the transparency. The government is telling us, "Here is your truth; it gets you nowhere."

I've said this already, but maybe it's still not clear what I'm asking you, Vince. I'm not asking you about legally binding consequences. I am asking you if there are different kinds of facts that are good enough for civil trials but not good enough for criminal trials, as people like Posner and the articles I have read imply. My contention is that facts are facts, and a fact established in a civil trial is as factual as a fact established in a criminal trial, so that the fact that the U.S. government conspired to kill MLK will remain a fact– not only in your head and my head and the heads of millions of other (especially black) people, but also, now, in the record of this trial by jury. It is a historical fact in the fullest sense of the word.

This is what the King family wanted, and I think the government wanted it too, and both for the same reason. The message is the same, although for one it is a sad message of defeat and for the other a happy message of triumph.

I will comment on the other matters you bring up, but some of that is personal and I don't want to mix that, or a discussion about Newman and Turner, up with the point that I am trying to make here, which I think is more important. And forgive me, but I believe I was first.

This is your bailiwick, Vincent. You are a lawyer. You worked with Jim Garrison. I still have respect for the law, if it is practiced by honest people. I know you know that the government killed MLK. I'm not asking you that. I'm asking you when a fact can be taken as a fact, in legal terms. As I see it, the U.S. government conspiracy to kill MLK is now established fact, even if it was "only" a civil trial and even if no criminal or further pursuit is possible.

If you don't think this is true, from a legal point of view, please try again to get it through my thick skull.

VS (1/3/2000)

Mike, I feel that my post of 12/20/99 answered your questions. Of course, there is no difference in what is considered a fact in a civil and a criminal case. But findings of fact are made by a jury, or a judge in the absence of a jury, or an administrative body in the case of administrative agency hearings. They are made in both civil and criminal cases against the defendant or defendants. No findings of fact are made against persons who are not parties to the litigation.

Would you want findings of fact which are negative about you made in a case to which you are not a party? Don't you want to be able to produce contrary documentary and evidentiary testimonial evidence to contradict negative findings about you? Don't you want the opportunity to cross-examine witnesses who testify against you? Of course you do. Therefore, if you are not a party to a litigation, no facts can be found at the trial which

are in any way binding on you and in any way can impugn your integrity, morality and legality. Accordingly as a matter of law members of the 111th Military Intelligence Group based at Ft. McPherson in Atlanta, Georgia were not found to be in Memphis on the day MLK was killed. Members of the Army Intelligence team were not legally found to be in Memphis on that day. An eight-man sniper team were not present in Memphis that day, etc..

Now, I believe that all the incriminating evidence introduced by Pepper is probably true. But as a legal matter none of it is proven. As a legal matter that Memphis trial did not impugn the integrity of the U.S. Government, the Memphis police or even the Mafia which will ultimately be shown by the U.S. government to have paid Jowers. No findings of any nature were legally determined by the case except against Jowers. Only Jowers was, as a consequence of that Memphis trial, found to be legally responsible for the killing.

The U.S. government could not enjoin a private suit in a state court. That much of states rights is still in our constitution.

If you want U.S. transparency in the MLK killing go to the matter of Ray getting a number of passports involving Canadian citizens all of whom were roughly Ray's age and appearance. That, my friend, transparently tells me that U.S. intelligence was involved in the killing of MLK. After the killing that dullard, Ray, became an international traveler. That is evidence of U.S. governmental complicity. MLK was killed one year after coming out against our involvement in Vietnam. That is transparent evidence of U.S. national security state motivation for dispatching MLK. That is transparent evidence of U.S. intelligence involvement. There is plenty of transparent U.S. involvement in the MLK killing. But as a lawyer, I cannot ascribe the trial in Memphis, over which the U.S. government had no control and was not a party, to a transparent showing of U.S. national security state guilt.

Mike, you and I apparently don't see the transparent conspiracy concept the same way. I see it as the U.S. government employing the idea as part of its post-Orwellian-mind control thrust which paralyzes public opinion. On the one hand the National Security State, having committed many crimes, defends itself by flat denials or protestations of immaculate mistakes. On the other hand, for those stupid marginal nuts like you and me, it flashes brief transparent signals at various times of its tremendous power in being able to commit these crimes and to have the society rally around the flag and defend its innocence. It thereby instructs us that should we want to engage in counterthrusts against all of its power, we will be totally marginalized and declared to be loonies without access to the mainstream public opinion.

Very early the national security state told me that should I wish to pursue my early work demonstrating a broad institutional killing of JFK, that my dedicated and beloved work in fighting for civil liberties with the ACLU could not continue. This was born out when in 1965 Professor Jacob Cohen of Brandeis visited me and warned me that I should not be doing this JFK work but rather should be continuing my work in civil liberties and civil rights. This was born out when I first visited Michael and Ruth Paine in 1965. Michael, who was not supposed to know who I was, started out his conversation with me by stating that I should not be doing the JFK work but rather should continue my work in civil liberties. This was born out when I continued the JFK work, and the ACLU sought and obtained my resignation.

I never saw the transparent conspiracy as a design of the national security state to advertise widely to the general public that it had killed JFK. The national security state is not in the business of marshalling forces and organizing real political revolutions against it. Rather, the transparent conspiracists by selecting a patsy who was connected with all elements of the U.S. left, were signaling to the Cold War weakened U.S. left–its potential opposition–that the left would be hurt badly if it tried to exercise its weak political muscle against real power. The left got the message. I.F. Stone in instructing us that critics of the Warren Commission belonged in a loony bin, was simply stating a "political" truth. Anyone who believed that bearing witness to the truth in the JFK assassination in the Cold War United States could serve any useful political purpose did belong in a loony bin.

The full truth about the JFK assassination is in my judgment still not a politically viable concept within the today's U.S. empire. If you want proof of this, think of the present low standing of Marty and me even in our little loving e-mail community. Marty has been declared to be deranged. One of you, who will go unnamed, has recently written that I am seriously mentally ill. But be assured that so long as you are willing to reason intelligently and honestly, Marty and I can take and benefit from your vigorous opposition to our views. With the exception of the transparent conspiracy concept Marty and I are substantially and materially in agreement with regard to the killers of JFK and their reasons for killing him. Allow me to predict that in this new millennium, when the empire falls–as it will–the truth about the assassination phase of our national security state will emerge. I predict that when the truth of the meaning of the assassination phase of our national security state does emerge, it will provide a powerful argument in proof of its evil. I predict that this proof will constitute a strong impetus to the peoples of our planet for reshaping our political and economic systems. I predict that with these changes we will be more peaceful, freer and will be able to achieve non-violently a more equitable distribution of our planet's great wealth.

VS (1/4/2000)

Gary, with respect to the garment holes, here is the way I see it. I recall talking to Professor Jacob Cohen of Brandeis in 1965 about the holes. He admitted that he tried very hard to conduct experiments which would demonstrate the plausibility of the holes comporting with the single-bullet theory. He conceded that he could not accomplish the bunching necessary to sustain the single-bullet theory. Later in Boston at a panel discussion I presented him with a suit coat and shirt with the holes clearly marked and tapes attached to the marked position of the holes. I asked him to duplicate for the audience the bunching process. Without making any effort to undertake this impossible task, he threw the garments back at me.

I discussed the position of those holes with Gaeton Fonzi. He then went to Arlen Specter and interviewed him. He later put to this sophisticated progenitor of the single-bullet theory the problem of the position of the holes. Specter's answer which came in the form of stuttering and stammering convinced Gaeton that he could not believe the government's account. From that experience with Specter, Gaeton then was motivated to become the great and courageous investigator who pinned the operatives high up in the lap of the CIA.

I discussed in my 1998 Dallas speech that my father was a custom tailor who made custom coats. He worked in our home. From observing him at his work and visiting

the fine shops for whom he did sub-contractual work, I knew something about how custom coats fit and how precisely they were fitted onto the affluent customers. In my judgment, no custom coat maker in the world would have been able to support the single-bullet theory. Specter's shirt was custom made. I would urge that even if his shirt had not been tucked into his trouser belt, there was no way his custom shirt could have ridden up approximately five inches from waving his hands no higher than his shoulder.

Now, we have Steve Just Jones telling us that he conducted experiments and was unable to accomplish through his experimentation the feat necessary to render less than fraudulent the single bullet theory.

Let us assume for the purpose of argument that the position of the garment holes did not prove the Warren Report fraudulent. But on November 22, 1963 the position of those holes, combined with the smell of gunpowder in the Dealey Plaza area, combined with the witness accounts of shots from the grassy knoll area, combined with the leftward and backward snap of the President's head and body from what clearly appeared to be an impact phenomenon, combined with the fact that no witness account described JFK and Connally as hit by the same bullet, combined with the bullet impacts on the chrome and front windshield of the presidential limousine, combined with the discovery of the almost pristine CE 399 bullet, the bullet hit on James T. Tague, and combined with the rest of the Dealey Plaza evidence, clearly spoke on November 22, 1963 to the fraud of the Warren Commission Report. No innocent government on November 22, 1963 would have had to conduct any experiments on the clothing to have known that the most overwhelmingly plausible explanation of these data was a killing resulting from a triangulated cross-fire by multiple assassins. This, when combined with the communication to Air Force One and to the cabinet plane over the Pacific that Oswald was the assassin before there was any evidence implicating him and while there was overwhelming evidence of conspiracy, speaks to the guilt at the highest levels of our government. This combined with what we now know of the CIA and the Joint Chiefs having been opposed to the Kennedy foreign policy tells us that the national security state was the killing force behind the assassination.

Now to *The Nation*. You know of what is in Marty's book about my brother-in-law, Harold Feldman, having written a piece which *The Nation* entitled "Oswald and the FBI" when in fact the piece focused more extensively on Oswald and the CIA. You know that Fred J. Cook, *The Nation's* chief investigative contributing reporter, published in *The Nation* a piece which indicated that Castro might have been involved in the assassination, and that it was a conspiracy.

After that article appeared, I visited Fred J. Cook with my friend, Tom Katen. Within a short time of discussion, Fred J. Cook, a truly remarkable man, recognized that he was wrong about Castro's involvement and was persuaded that the killing was the work of the warfare state about which he knew and had written much. From then on, Fred J. Cook was persona non grata in the *Nation* on any matter relating to the Kennedy assassination.

Thereafter *The Nation,* through Alexander Cockburn and others, defended the Warren Report and heaped praise on such government whores as Belin and Epstein.

Now, Gary, I continue to subscribe to *The Nation*. I consider it an outstanding magazine. But on matters of the Kennedy assassination, there is no question in my mind, based on the evidence that I have at hand, that it was guilty of consciously covering for

what it recognized was a crime against democracy and humanity. There was no question in my mind that it was and still is steeped in terrible guilt. There was no question in my mind that its guilt grew out of knowledge of what happened and did not emanate from mere ignorance of its staff.

If I had been invited to speak to the *Nation* staff prior to the formation of the Committee of Correspondence I would have accepted it. I would have gone there accompanied by John Newman. I would not have confronted Newman, and declared him to be an agent. I would not have set forth my now fixed feelings that *The Nation* was not only wrong on the assassination, but that it actively involved itself in being a criminal accessory after the fact to the killing of President Kennedy. In short, I would have tried hard to win the *Nation* over to a truthful acceptance of how and why President Kennedy was killed.

But, now Gary, after having had my thinking sharpened by the interchange with the good people in our correspondence, I would not have accepted *The Nation's* invitation without indicting them for their criminal behavior. I would have felt obligated to point out their criminality at the almost certain risk that the rest of my presentation would have been ignored by them. I would do this, because I feel that unless the *Nation* was willing to change and admit prior wrongdoing, there is no way that it can be trusted to expound on the powerful truths of the Kennedy assassination and the exposure that such light offers to the ugly national security power that lies behind it. Unless *The Nation* would be willing to come clean, I would fear that *The Nation* could and would sanitize what I was saying to the staff in order to explain the data in such a way as to exculpate the forces behind the assassination. I would question why John Newman, who even now will not concede that he knows anything about what happened in Dealey Plaza, was being invited to present along with me. I would question why *The Nation* invited John Newman who will not even now admit that there was a conspiracy. I would ask John Newman what he expected to accomplish by presenting to *The Nation*.

I would consider myself duty bound to reveal my motivations, Newman's stated motivations and the nature and content of his presentation, and *The Nation's* response to the presentations to whomever was interested. This is what my education from the members of the Committee of Correspondence would require me to do.

MM (1/5/99)

I am still trying hard, under your tutelage, Vince, to understand the meaning of the word "fact" in relation to the other terms we are using, such as "legally binding" and "finding of fact" and "against." Because I believe this discussion is very important, I will quote your letter of 1/3/2000 closely. I want to understand you as clearly as possible on these points.

I feel that my post of 12/20/99 answered your questions.

No, if you mean 12/28/99, this letter did not address the questions I asked. There you explained the difference between preponderance of evidence and reasonable doubt, but not how this applies, or if it applies at all, to the ascertainment of facts. Then you described the Jowers case as "a side show equivalent to the Mafia theory in the JFK killing." The next three pages were quotes from Hinckle and Turner's book.

Of course, there is no difference in what is considered a fact in a civil and a criminal case.

You say "of course" as if this were obvious, but it is not at all obvious. On the contrary, as I said, the newspaper accounts imply clearly that this is not true, and that if the case had been a criminal one the facts would be somehow more certain, more correct, more true, more reliable, etc. I haven't read the Posner article yet but I suspect he will say or imply the same. What you are saying, Vince, is that if this had been a criminal trial–against Jowers as the trigger man, for example–the fact that the US government conspired to murder MLK would not have been an iota more "correct," i.e., less a fact, than it is right now.

Thus you confirm my suspicion that the media, more specifically Posner et al., are purposely disseminating the lie that facts established in a civil trial are less certain than facts established in a criminal trial.

But findings of fact are made by a jury, or a judge in the absence of a jury, or an administrative body in the case of administrative agency hearings. They are made in both civil and criminal cases against the defendant or defendants. No findings of fact are made against persons who are not parties to the litigation.

I suspect the key words here are "finding" and "against." You cannot mean that no facts are established concerning or involving third parties, because that would mean very few facts of any kind could ever be established. Obviously, facts can be established, and on the basis of these facts, juries and judges arrive at specific further conclusions–namely the guilt or innocence of the accused.

Do you agree, Vince, that it would be accurate to say that the fact that the US government was involved in a conspiracy to murder King was established by the Jowers trial, even though this fact was not legally binding on anyone but Jowers? It is not "less" a fact because it has no legal consequences, is it?

Would you want findings of fact which are negative about you made incase to which you are not a party? Don't you want to be able to produce contrary documentary and evidentiary testimonial evidence to contradict negative findings about you? Don't you want the opportunity to cross-examine witnesses who testify against you? Of course you do. Therefore, if you are not a party to a litigation, no facts can be found at the trial which are in any way binding on you and in any way can impugn your integrity, morality and legality.

Again, the crucial difference apparently is in the phrase "legally binding." Let me risk a return to my analogy of Alphonse and Elvira. Suppose Elvira was having an affair with Clyde, her neighbor (also married), at the time she shot Alphonse. Would the prosecutor be prohibited from adducing evidence to demonstrate this, in order to support the argument for premeditation? I think not. Could the fact of the affair be established? Certainly. 19 witnesses testify to seeing Clyde and Elvira exchanging intimacies, one or two caught them in flagrante, Elvira told her best friend about it, etc. These are the facts, the evidence, on which the conclusion–that they had an affair–is based, and this conclusion, once established, can then be treated as a fact as well.

I think what you are saying is that the fact that Clyde was having an affair with Elvira, though established as a fact in the trial, cannot later be used as a given in a trial against Clyde, or used in any legal way against Clyde, since he was not a party to the litigation in Elvira's trial. It is, however, still a fact, and a fact established in a court of law. It is also a fact that can have a significant impact on Clyde's life, since if it comes out as a fact in the trial no one will doubt that he is an adulterer. He may not suffer any

legal consequences from this, but his wife, family, friends, neighbors, and employer may have negative reactions upon learning this fact and change their behavior towards him as a result. Thus we can certainly say that facts established concerning non-litigants can and do have significant psychological, social and political consequences, even if they have no legal consequences.

Accordingly as a matter of law members of the 111th Military Intelligence Group based at Ft. McPherson in Atlanta, Georgia were not found to be in Memphis on the day MLK was killed. Members of the Army Intelligence team were not legally found to be in Memphis on that day. An eight-man sniper, were not present in Memphis that day, etc.

The key words here, again, are "as a matter of law" and "legally found." However, would you contend that these are not facts? They were not "facts found to be legally binding," but they were established as facts, were they not? How else could the jury have come to a verdict based on these facts, and how else could exactly the words expressing these facts, find their way, verbatim, into the judge's reading of the verdict?

By the same token, you will say that "as a legal matter," Elvira did not have an affair with Clyde, that none of the 19 witnesses witnessed what they testified under oath to having witnessed, that no one saw them in bed together, etc. But that is not the same as saying these things are in doubt, or not facts, is it?

Now, I believe that all the incriminating evidence introduced by Pepper is probably true. But as a legal matter none of it is proven. As a legal matter that Memphis trial did not impugn the integrity of the U.S. Government, the Memphis police or even the Mafia which will ultimately be shown by the U.S. government to have paid Jowers. No findings of any nature were legally determined by the case except against Jowers. Only Jowers was, as a consequence of that Memphis trial, found to be legally responsible for the killing.

This is interesting. You say "probably," even though these facts were accepted by twelve jurors, a judge, and both parties to the suit. They have not been "proven as a legal matter," but why does this induce you to describe them as only "probably" true? What would it require for you to be able to say that these facts are certainly true, or as true as anything can be in our society–regardless of their legal consequences (or lack of same)?

Now, as to the significance of the verdict. You seem to think it has no significance because it has no legally binding consequences for the government. It is highly significant to the King family, however, and to me, and to Joe Stimmins, and to many other people, I'm sure. Are we exaggerating its significance? I don't think so. I'm not a lawyer so I can't do the research, but I would like to ask you this: How many cases, civil or criminal, can you find where the US government is named as a conspirator to murder, where evidence demonstrating this is presented convincingly to a jury and a judge, and where the jury's verdict and the judge's reading of the verdict explicitly state as a fact that the US government was involved in a conspiracy to murder (anyone, much less a beloved popular leader)? Are there any at all?

I doubt it. On that basis alone, the Jowers verdict is HUGELY significant. But instead we find the media (and even you) treating this event as hardly noteworthy, as if facts such as this appear every day in trials of one sort or another, and have no significance, merely because they are not legally binding on the US government.

Again, I would do the research if I could: How many cases, civil or criminal, are there on the books where similar facts are established in the course and outcome of a

trial, and then characterized afterwards as being "perhaps true" or "probably true," or as anything less than completely true and factual–regardless of whether or not they are legally binding? Posner et al. are treating this fact of government conspiracy as if it were just another crazy theory perversely treated as fact in a courtroom. How many other examples are there of such "crazy theories" being treated as facts in a courtroom? Have alien landings from outer space, for example, ever been established as a fact in a court of law (even though not legally binding to the aliens)? Of course not.

On the contrary, I suspect we have another precedent. The Jowers verdict may not only be the first time such a hugely significant fact has been established in a court of law (though without legal consequences), but also the first time such a fact has been subsequently treated as a non-fact by the media and thus by the public in general.

The U.S. government could not enjoin a private suit in a state court. That much of states rights is still in our constitution.

That leaves the question of whether they could have stopped it by extra-legal force. Is there any doubt in your mind that the federal government could have, if they had wanted to?

If you want U.S. transparency in the MLK killing go to the matter of Ray getting a number of passports involving Canadian citizens all of whom were roughly Ray's age and appearance. That, my friend, transparently tells me that U.S. intelligence was involved in the killing of MLK. After the killing that dullard, Ray, became an international traveler. That is evidence of U.S. governmental complicity. MLK was killed one year after coming out against our involvement in Vietnam. That is transparent evidence of U.S. national security state motivation for dispatching MLK. That is transparent evidence of U.S. intelligence involvement. There is plenty of transparent U.S. involvement in the MLK killing. But as a lawyer, I cannot ascribe the trial in Memphis, over which the U.S. government had no control and was not a party, to a transparent showing of U.S. national security state guilt.

Vince, do you really believe that the US government, who killed MLK, JFK, RFK, 58,000 Americans and several million Vietnamese (among many others), could not have had control over that trial if they had wanted to?

This is like the removal of JFK's security in Dallas. The trial and verdict simply would not have happened, at least not with this outcome, if the federal government had not allowed it. The very outcome of the Jowers trial tells us this. If the government is powerful enough to kill MLK, and get away with it, they would certainly be powerful enough to prevent precisely this fact from being established in a court of law.

Ergo, they want us to know. This is precisely the point. They are powerful enough not only to do it and get away with, but powerful enough to confess it with impunity, and in fact without any negative consequences at all. There have been no riots, as far as I know, and here I am, arguing with none other than Vincent Salandria about whether the verdict has any significance at all.

Thus the Jowers verdict tells exactly what the circus in Dallas told (tells) us. As Reverend Joe Stimmins recently succinctly put it, the transparent message is: "Here is the truth. Fuck it, and you too."

Mike, you and I apparently don't see the transparent conspiracy concept the same way. I see it as the U.S. government employing the idea as part of its post-Orwellian-mind control thrust which paralyzes public opinion. On the one hand the National

Security State's having committed many crimes defends itself by flat denials or protestations of immaculate mistakes. On the other hand, for those stupid marginal nuts like you and me, it flashes brief transparent signals at various times of its tremendous power in being able to commit these crimes and to have the society rally around the flag and defend its innocence. It thereby instructs us that should we want to engage in counterthrusts against all of its power, that we will be totally marginalized and declared to be loonies without access to the main-stream public opinion.

There is absolutely no difference between your view of the concept of transparency and mine. Your description fits the Jowers verdict perfectly, as I have tried to explain.

I never saw the transparent conspiracy as a design of the national security state to advertise widely to the general public that it had killed JFK.

Of course not. The transparent message is to the small minority of people who care to spend their time thinking about such things. The majority will continue to see the whole thing as a continuing mystery, like the JFK case, thanks to people like Posner and the compliant–and complicit–media.

The national security state is not in the business of marshalling forces and organizing real political revolutions against it.

Are you sure? The US government has been and is certainly behind many so-called "revolutionary" movements, in this country and outside. You mean not revolutionary enough to be really revolutionary, I guess. That's the trick–to be "revolutionary," even be the accepted vanguard of potentially dangerous popular opposition, and at the same time harmless and totally under control. I think this describes the role of people like Chomsky and *The Nation*.

Rather, the transparent conspiracists by selecting a patsy who was connected with all elements of the U.S. left, were signaling to the Cold War weakened U.S. left–its potential opposition–that the left would be hurt badly, if it tried to exercise its weak political muscle against real power. The left got the message. I.F. Stone in instructing us that critics of the Warren Commission belonged in a loony bin, was simply stating a "political" truth. Anyone who believed that in Cold War United States that bearing witness to the truth in the JFK assassination could serve any useful political purpose did belong in a loony bin.

I don't think the left was any more intimidated than anybody else. The Oswald story was so phony from the beginning that "the left" could have easily demolished it and won a victory for themselves. No, I don't think this explains their failure to recognize the assassination for what it was. What explains Noam Chomsky's failure to recognize the assassination for what it was? Howard Zinn's? Alexander Cockburn's? I don't think Oswald's being a leftist or not has much to do with these people's attitudes now, and I don't see why it should have been any different in the past.

I'll comment on the rest of your letter another time. But let me skip to the last paragraph because it relates directly to the Jowers verdict:

Allow me to predict that in this new millennium, when the empire falls–as it will–the truth about the assassination phase of our national security state will emerge. I predict that when the truth of the meaning of the assassination phase of our national security state does emerge, it will provide a powerful argument in proof of its evil. I predict that this proof will constitute a strong impetus to the peoples of our planet for reshaping our

political and economic systems. I predict that with these changes we will be more peaceful, freer and will be able to achieve non-violently a more equitable distribution of our planet's great wealth.

I disagree with you, Vince, and I will let a quote from Schopenhauer I ran across recently explain why: "The truth has three stages: first it is ridiculed; then it is violently opposed; then it is accepted as self-evident."

I believe the Jowers verdict announces loud and clearly the arrival of Stage 3 in the MLK case. We are still in Stage Two in the JFK case, but we will arrive in due course at Stage 3, very likely in a similar way.

What do you think your reaction would be to the Jowers verdict if it had concerned the murder of JFK instead of MLK? Would you still call it a "side show"?

VS (1/5/2000)

Facts found as binding on the parties in criminal and civil cases are the same and different. They both are legally binding on the parties only, and no one not a party is bound by them. They conceivably may be different insofar as the burden of proof of guilt in a criminal case is when the judge, in the absence of a jury, or a jury, when there is a trial by jury, find guilt beyond a reasonable doubt. Whereas in a civil case, the winning party prevails with a preponderance of evidence. But an individual finding of fact in both a criminal and a civil case is whatever the judge–or in the case of a jury trial–the jury–finds a fact to be.

Now, given that trials are to some extent theatre, all kinds of contrary-to-fact propositions are found to be facts. The reasons for this are many. Some lawyers are more astute, or better actors and communicators than others. Perjurers are ubiquitous in the courts, and some can be very convincing. Sometimes judges and juries decide what is a fact not based on the evidence but based on their prejudices. There are so many reasons why lies can become facts in the judicial process. I don't want to appear completely cynical. I have won many a case based on truthful witnesses.

Mike, you say "the fact that the US government conspired to murder MLK would not have been an iota more "correct," i.e., less a fact, than it is right now." Since the U.S. government was not a party to the Jowers litigation, it is not a fact, except for purposes of that trial, that the U.S. government conspired to kill MLK. The purposes of that trial, as a legal matter, could not have had at issue the guilt or innocence of the U.S. government. The jury, in so concluding, may have been right or wrong. But in either event, no one can fairly conclude that the U.S. government was found guilty of anything by that trial since the government was not represented at the trial, was not joined as a defendant, and therefore had no opportunity to defend itself.

Yes, the fact established in the Jowers trial that the U.S. government conspired to kill MLK is "less" of a fact because the U.S. government was not a party to the litigation, is therefore not legally bound by the jury's conclusion, and therefore was provided no opportunity to defend itself.

Your analysis of your Alphonse and Elvira analogy is correct. But, the inapplicability of the analogy is clear when you think of what John Thomas would do to me, if I concluded from that trial that our national security state killed MLK. Again, I assign you the task of taking him on armed with your Alphonse and Elvira analogy. My money is bet on him.

I submit that the fact that the 111th Military Intelligence Group was in Memphis on the day MLK was killed is only a fact for purposes of the Jowers trial. The snipers were not at the trial to testify whether or not they were there or elsewhere and what if anything their assignment was with respect to killing MLK. There was not introduced, and there probably is and was no paper trail of their official orders. No lawyer representing the U.S. government was there to object to the testimony and to cross-examine the witnesses.

In the Elvira and Clyde analogy there is plenty of doubt. The witnesses might have been perjurers, or mentally incompetent, or have observed incorrectly, or prejudiced, or...

I say the "fact" that the U.S. government conspired to kill MLK is "probably" true because I don't consider myself an expert on the data. I do not know the evidence, and therefore cannot say that each item of evidence proves the fact of U.S. government conspiracy to kill MLK is absolutely true.

Although the U.S. government has killed or arranged to be killed millions of innocent people, to my knowledge the government has never been tried for its slaughter of so many.

If the U.S. government had attached great importance to the civil Jowers case, I believe that the government could have sabotaged the case as it did Garrison's case against Shaw. I infer from its failure to do so, that it correctly predicted that the mass media would give the decision short shrift. I deduce that the government in failing to obstruct the Jowers trial knew that even little nothings like Salandria would not be able to ascribe to the findings of the Jowers jury such importance that would induce even the alternative media to publicize the conclusions as significant.

If, as you suggest, the left could have easily demolished the Oswald story and "won a victory for themselves" why did they not do it and pick up their marbles? I suggest that U.S. intelligence structured into the Oswald patsy lone-assassin scenario the makings of an alternative. If the left felt inclined to rip the fabric of the Oswald lone-assassin concept, then the Mexico City Soviet and Cuban embassy material, the Fair Play for Cuba, the ACLU membership, "Militant," Soviet Defector, and other Oswaldian leftist baggage would have opened the way to a domestic pogrom against the left, and/or an invasion of Cuba and/or a preemptive thermonuclear strike against the Soviet Union. By Chomsky, Stone, Zinn and others affording credibility to the Warren Commission Report, they were behaving politically responsibly. In my announcement that the CIA killed Kennedy, I was behaving in a politically irresponsible manner. Bearing witness to the truth in the Kennedy assassination can be a lonely undertaking. With all due respect to Schopenhauer, another phase in truth telling to which he makes no reference is being ignored.

If the Jowers verdict had concerned the murder of JFK instead of MLK I would have yawned. Why would I need such judicial theatre when the U.S. government has provided me with material that proves (John Thomas and others to the contrary) beyond a scintilla of a doubt that the highest level of the national security state killed JFK to perpetuate the Cold War?

I do not think that the Jowers case represents an example of transparent conspiracy. I do believe that the Jowers case has an important significance. When the distinguished King family tells our criminal government that it is not interested in any

further government investigations, that is important. The family members are therefore instructing the government that the King family knows that the U.S. warfare apparatus killed noble Martin Luther King. The King family wants no more governmental investigations into its own murders. The family is telling the government that the killing of this great man was not the result of a crazy right-wing civilian loony plot. The family is telling the world that the U.S. military not only barbarizes the rest of the world but kills this nation's own great men who seek to obstruct our state from making war and profit for the military-intelligence complex. The King family therefore–through Pepper's use of a civilian court as a stage to reenact the crucifixion of King by the national security state–was of great service to humanity. I thank, salute and congratulate them.

MM (1/6/2000)

Thanks, Vince, for being so patient with me. Obviously I have a lot to learn about the law, but I am trying. I will quote from your letter again, to keep this as coherent as possible.

Facts found as binding on the parties in criminal and civil cases are the same and different. They both are legally binding on the parties only, and no one not a party is bound by them. They conceivably may be different insofar as the burden of proof of guilt in a criminal case is when the judge, in the absence of a jury, or a jury, when there is a trial by jury, find guilt beyond a reasonable doubt. Whereas in a civil case, the winning party prevails with a preponderance of evidence. But an individual finding of fact in both a criminal and a civil case is whatever the judge–or in the case of a jury trial–the jury–finds a fact to be.

If I understand you, you mean the facts are the same in that they are binding only on the litigants, but different in that they may amount to (i.e., add up to) a different conclusion in criminal and civil courts. Capito.

Your last sentence is not so clear. Does the term "finding of fact" have any special or different legal meaning than "establishment of fact"? I assume it does not. Therefore we can say that Fact X (that the US government was involved in a conspiracy to murder MLK) was "found" and "established" in the Jowers trial. It was found after 4 weeks of testimony by 70 witnesses.

But you tell me that:

Now, given that trials are to some extent theatre, all kinds of contrary-to-fact propositions are found to be facts. The reasons for this are many. Some lawyers are more astute, or better actors and communicators than others. Perjurers are ubiquitous in the courts, and some can be very convincing. Sometimes judges and juries decide what is a fact not based on the evidence but based on their prejudices. There are so many reasons why lies can become facts in the judicial process. I don't want to appear completely cynical. I have won many a case based on truthful witnesses.

and that Fact X

is not a fact, except for purposes of that trial.... The purposes of that trial, as a legal matter, could not have had at issue the guilt or innocence of the U.S. government. The jury, in so concluding, may have been right or wrong. But in either event, no one can fairly conclude that the U.S. government was found guilty of anything by that trial since the government was not represented at the trial, was not joined as a defendant, and therefore had no opportunity to defend itself.

Vince, you are saying two completely different things here. It is one thing to say the US government was not "found" guilty (no one is saying that), and quite another to say that their guilt, i.e., Fact X, "is not a fact.

Yes, Mike, the fact established in the Jowers trial that the U.S. government conspired to kill MLK is "less" of a fact because the U.S. government was not a party to the litigation, is therefore not legally bound by the jury's conclusion, and therefore was provided no opportunity to defend itself.

This I do not follow at all. What do you mean, "less" of a fact? I put the word in quotation marks because I don't think there can be "more" or "less" of a fact. Either it is a fact or it isn't. Maybe it cannot be determined whether something is a fact or not, but if it is a fact, it is fact. You seem to be saying that facts that are legally binding are "more factual" than other facts. I submit that this is absurd. Facts are facts, and when the facts add up to something that can then also be considered a fact AND that fact is legally binding, then that fact is legally binding. But that is something additional and separate from the fact itself. The fact(s) exist–or do not–whether they are legally binding or not.

Your analysis of your Alphonse and Elvira analogy is correct. But, the inapplicability of the analogy is clear when you think of what John Thomas would do to me, if I concluded from that trial that our national security state killed MLK. Again, I assign you the task of taking him on armed with your Alphonse and Elvira analogy. My money is bet on him.

Vince, I assign you the task of convincing William Pepper and the King family (as well as me) that Fact X is not a fact, or a fact only "for purposes of that trial."

I submit that the fact that the 111th Military Intelligence Group was in Memphis on the day MLK was killed is only a fact for purposes of the Jowers trial. The snipers were not at the trial to testify whether or not they were there or elsewhere and what if anything their assignment was with respect to killing MLK. There was not introduced, and their probably is and was no paper trail of their official orders. No lawyer representing the U.S. government was there to object to the testimony and to cross-examine the witnesses.

If this is true, Vince, then all the "facts" established at the trial, and at all trials, are facts "only for the purposes" of whatever trial they are established in. That would include the name of the defendant, the names of the plaintiff, their dates and places of birth, etc. That is patently absurd.

In the Elvira and Clyde analogy there is plenty of doubt. The witnesses might have been perjurers, or mentally incompetent, or have observed incorrectly, or prejudiced, or...

Vince, forgive me, but isn't that is why we have courts, juries, judges, and the adversarial system–to settle the doubts? Would you say there was still "plenty of doubt" about Clyde's being an adulterer, after 70 witnesses testified over 4 weeks to that effect, after both adversarial sides argued in support of this fact, after a jury unanimously and explicitly stated that they believed on the basis of the evidence that Clyde was indeed an adulterer, and the judge so repeated and ruled?

I say the "fact" that the U.S. government conspired to kill MLK is "probably" true because I don't consider myself an expert on the data. I do not know the evidence, and therefore cannot say that each item of evidence proves the fact of U.S. government conspiracy to kill MLK is absolutely true.

"Each item of evidence," as you must know, does not have to prove it. The conglomeration of it does, and did in this case, to the jurors, both counsels, and the judge.

"Absolutely true" brings us into the realm of the metaphysical. We are talking about what can be considered "facts" and "truth" in our society, according to the institutions that have been developed for precisely that purpose. "Absolute truth" is anybody's business. We are talking about the difference between people saying and writing books and articles stating Fact X, and a judge and jury saying it.

Although the U.S. government has killed or arranged to be killed millions of innocent people, to my knowledge the government has never been tried for its slaughter of so many.

That was not my question. My question was if the US government has ever been named as a conspirator in the death of anyone, much less a beloved popular leader, and had this fact confirmed by a jury and a judge. I thought this was a relatively straightforward question, and that it would be easy to research. It is beyond me, but I challenge you or anyone else to do it. The answer to this question is knowable, and I would like to know it.

If the U.S. government had attached great importance to the civil Jowers case, I believe that the government could have sabotaged the case as it did Garrison's case against Shaw. I infer from its failure to do so that it correctly predicted that the mass media would give the decision short shrift. I deduce that the government in failing to obstruct the Jowers trial knew that even little nothings like Salandria would not be able to ascribe to the findings of the Jowers jury such importance that would induce even the alternative media to publicize the conclusions as significant.

Yes, you're probably right that the government predicted correctly. And I'm very sorry, but in this case from a cui bono standpoint you are doing exactly the same work as Posner–arguing against the significance of this verdict. Maybe you are both right, but I am not yet convinced.

I think what I need to be convinced is a bunch of verdicts in similar cases that would make clear what you say–that all sorts of untruths and lies can be accepted and established as "facts" in a trial, and still be dismissed as non-existent, or at most "probably existent (true)" afterwards. By "similar cases," I have to add, I don't mean those in which the judge is drunk or something like that, but in a serious case involving prominent people, which had to be important to the government, and which they were (by their own admission) monitoring closely.

Now switching topics: the left reaction to Dallas.

If, as you suggest, the left could have easily demolished the Oswald story and "won a victory for themselves" why did they not do it and pick up their marbles? I suggest that U.S. intelligence structured into the Oswald patsy lone-assassin scenario the makings of an alternative. If the left felt inclined to rip the fabric of the Oswald lone-assassin concept, then the Mexico City Soviet and Cuban embassy material, the Fair Play for Cuba, the ACLU membership, "Militant," Soviet Defector, and other Oswaldian leftist baggage would have opened the way to a domestic pogrom against the left, and/or an invasion of Cuba and/or a preemptive thermonuclear strike against the Soviet Union.

I agree with this, but it does not explain why the left should have been so intimidated by this "alternative scenario" that they shut up like clams. Most of all, it does not explain why their heads are still in the sand today.

By Chomsky, Stone, Zinn and others affording credibility to the Warren Commission Report, they were behaving politically responsibly. In my announcement that the CIA killed Kennedy, I was behaving in a politically irresponsible manner. Bearing witness to the truth in the Kennedy assassination can be a lonely undertaking. With all due respect to Schopenhauer, another phase in truth telling to which he makes no reference is being ignored.

Yes, although I don't know what you mean by "responsibly." In any case, they have behaved that way all along. There has been no change. And today there is no chance of the JFK assassination being blamed on leftists, Cubans, communists, Russians, etc. This is not what is controlling Chomsky et al. Or do you think so?

If the Jowers verdict had concerned the murder of JFK instead of MLK I would have yawned. Why would I need such judicial theatre when the U.S. government has provided me with material that proves (John Thomas and others to the contrary) beyond a scintilla of a doubt that the highest level of the national security state killed JFK to perpetuate the Cold War?

You may have that material and the ability to evaluate it, Vince, but the general public does not. Again, that, I believe, is why we have a legal apparatus. The public relies on the law to ascertain facts. Before the Jowers verdict, we had a bunch of books saying Fact X, people saying it, etc. Now we have it being said by a judge and jury. You say there is no difference. You yawn. You prefer to ascertain the facts yourself. Good luck. The man in the street, though, is much more likely to believe Fact X if it comes from a judge and jury than if it comes from an article or speech by you or me or anybody else.

I do not think that the Jowers case represents an example of transparent conspiracy. I do believe that the Jowers case has an important significance. When the distinguished King family tells our criminal government that it is not interested in any further government investigations, that is important. The family members are therefore instructing the government that the King family knows that the U.S. warfare apparatus killed noble Martin Luther King. The King family wants no more governmental investigations into its own murders. The family is telling the government that the killing of this great man was not the result of a crazy right-wing civilian loony plot. The family is telling the world that the U.S. military not only barbarizes the rest of the world but kills this nation's own great men who seek to obstruct our state from making war and profit for the military-intelligence complex. The King family therefore–through Pepper's use of a civilian court as a stage to reenact the crucifixion of King by the national security state–was of great service to humanity. I thank, salute and congratulate them.

Well, this sounds a lot different than calling it a side show, but I cannot (yet) accept your characterization of the judicial process in this case as mere theater, and I don't think the King family or Pepper would accept it, either.

Your witness, Counsel.

VS (1/7/2000)

Mike, I don't think that it is fair of you to take up my time while you argue the law with me. Out of respect for you, I will try briefly, just once more, to answer you. Then you can consider that you won the argument and all that you contend is correct, and I am all wet and in bed with Posner.

With respect to the facts in criminal and civil cases being the same and different, I think you have it right.

Again, and again, I repeat that facts found at a trial are binding only on the parties. Pepper, being the excellent lawyer that he is, would agree with this simple statement that every lawyer knows. Not only the names of the parties, their dates and places of birth, but any fact found by a judge at a trial is binding on the parties–but only on the parties.

Mike, forgive me, but we don't have courts, juries, judges and the adversarial system to settle doubts regarding non-parties. How can a system be deemed adversarial with respect to a non-party when a non-party is given no authority in a suit to defend itself? Because a non-party to a suit is not an adversary, the fact-finding function of the court system is not applicable to non-parties.

Has the U.S. government ever been named as a party in a legal case as a conspirator in the death of anyone? I doubt it. The Jowers case does not qualify as such a case, since the U.S. government was not a party to the litigation. If this puts me on the same side as Posner, and I don't know whether it does, because I don't read Posner, then so be it. I would guess that Posner is against cancer, and we would share common ground in that area also.

With respect to the man in the street and his beliefs concerning the Warren Commission Report, he does not need a case at law or me to know that there is a conspiracy. Every public opinion poll indicates that from the beginning, the person in the street believed there was a conspiracy and that the U.S. government was lying to him.

Mike, you are a fine student. It turns out that I am just not up to snuff as a teacher. But, in any event, I am finished with this lecturing on the law. Please feel free to believe what you want to believe and to act on those beliefs as you see fit.

MM (1/8/99)

Vince, I was not aware that I was wasting your time. I have not been wasting mine. Our exchange has made several things clear:

1. Contrary to the implications in the media, facts established in a civil case are no less correct than facts established in a criminal case.

That means that all of the references to the difference between "preponderance of evidence" and evidence "beyond a reasonable doubt" in the Jowers verdict are not only completely irrelevant, but also misleading, and probably purposely so in most cases.

2. This question is important: To what extent can facts established in (either civil or criminal) trials, although not legally binding to anyone, be taken as facts?

Vince says not at all. I beg to differ. I believe that such facts have more importance, that is, are generally more readily accepted as facts by the public, than facts established in other contexts (e.g., in publications). For example, the civil trial of O.J. Simpson established his guilt as a fact, though it was not legally binding. I did not follow those trials, but I think most people who did will agree with me (or perhaps only most people who are not lawyers). I am trying to say that the guilt of the US government in the conspiracy to murder MLK was similarly established in the Jowers trial.

3. This question is also important: Has the US government ever been named as a conspirator to murder anyone, much less a beloved popular leader, in the verdict of any court in the United States (civil, criminal, state, city, or federal), even though this fact is not legally binding on the US government? To put it differently, has this proposition ever

been treated as a fact and explicitly stated in the verdict of a judge and jury, even though it is not legally binding on the US government?

Vince insists on misunderstanding this question as "Has the US government ever been named as a party in a legal case as a conspirator in the death of anyone?" He inserts "as a party" into the question, which changes it to "Has the US ever been tried for murder or conspiracy to murder?" (in a US court). I have made it clear enough, I think, that that is not the question I am asking.

I am asking if the words referring to the participation of the US government (and not "elements of the government," I might add) in a conspiracy to murder, and referring to this as an established fact, not as speculation, have ever appeared in any verdict in any US courtroom.

Vince is obviously peeved that I accused him of "being in bed" with Posner. I did not. I said they were both arguing against the significance of the Jowers verdict and therefore have the same cui bono effect. That doesn't mean they are conspiring.

VS (1/10/2000)

Mike, allow me to address your comments on the law. A fact established in a civil case is no less correct than a fact established in a criminal case, but the verdicts are different. In order to arrive at a verdict in a civil case there must be for the fact finder(s) a preponderance, or more than 50% of the evidence. In order to arrive at a guilty verdict in a criminal trial the fact finder(s) must find facts that amount to guilt beyond a reasonable doubt, or said differently any doubt that a reasonable person may entertain. For a non-party to a suit, under the law, no fact determined in a suit may be used at law against any non-party to a suit.

Since the system is adversarial, if a person or entity is not a party to the action, then no fact found in that action can be determined to be a fact legally found against a non-party. That is the way it is, Mike. I did not make the legal system. I don't even like it. But I am a rather successful practitioner in it, and know something about it.

Now, you are free to interpret the Jowers case and its findings any way you wish. Because facts found in any case, civil or criminal, are not true facts, i.e. things that have actually happened and are actually true. Facts found in a law case are merely legal facts and not necessarily actual facts. They may or may not be actual facts. I just want to caution you, that Posner or anyone can with assurance counter you with what I have said above, and many times before, to you.

The O.J. Simpson civil trial is a most inapt analogy. O.J. Simpson was a party to the civil action. He had an opportunity to defend himself. The jury found against him. Therefore, I can say with assurance that O.J. Simpson was found guilty by a civil jury of killing two persons. I can say, because O.J. Simpson was a party in a criminal case against him, that the jury was wrong in finding him innocent. I examined the evidence in that criminal case, and I know that there was evidence that should have convicted him beyond a reasonable doubt. The jury for its reasons nullified the law.

What I have been trying to tell you, Mike, over and over again, is that legal cases and their findings of fact are not the best repositories of truth and falsity. When I reviewed Jim Garrison's case before the trial, I was completely convinced that Clay Shaw was guilty of having been involved in the conspiracy to kill JFK. But I was almost 100% sure that there was no way that Jim would obtain a conviction. I think that Jim also much

doubted a conviction could be obtained. But he did his duty as a prosecutor, and I believe that some good came out of the trial.

Perhaps, from the Shaw trial I can defend what you are trying to do with the Jowers trial. Let's try. For example, I helped in the cross-examination of Finck. We got him to concede under oath that the autopsy was aborted by military command. Now, that is a fact established in a failed prosecution. Although the U.S. government was not party to the matter, its agent, Finck, was a witness under oath and sworn to tell the truth in the Shaw trial. He was brought into the case by means of a subpoena served upon him. We cannot say from that testimony that as a matter of law that the U.S. government obstructed justice in aborting the autopsy. But we can conclude, and logically and safely, but not as a matter of binding law, that the U.S. government through its agents obstructed justice.

If there were an international tribunal which would try the U.S. national security state for a crime against humanity in killing JFK, then Finck could be called as a witness. His prior testimony could be used to contradict him should he wish to change it. Does this help you in what you are trying to accomplish? I hope so, Mike.

I am trying to get onto a project which I think is important. You may think it is swatting flies. But at the risk of being deemed arrogant, I would like to get off of this subject and onto my project.

MM (1/12/2000)

I address this to the group lest I be accused again of wasting Vince's time. I know a couple of others of you are interested too, because you have told me, and I don't want Vince to feel obligated to "lecture" me further on the law. Comments are appreciated but not required. If anyone wastes his time reading and or responding to this letter, it's his own damn fault.

However, I will continue in the second person for convenience.

Vince, I keep telling you that I am not talking about "facts legally found against a non-party," and you keep telling me, getting angrier and angrier, that facts cannot be legally found against a non-party. I say one thing, and you respond as if I had said the exact opposite.

The point which you brush aside is the first point I listed in my last letter, and which you have already confirmed: "a fact established in a civil case is no less correct than a fact established in a criminal case, but..."

No "buts" about it. That is Point No. 1.

And as I said, it is highly significant because it exposes the attempt of the media to undermine the significance of the verdict as pure propaganda. THE DIFFERENCE BETWEEN CIVIL AND CRIMINAL TRIALS HAS NOTHING WHATEVER TO DO WITH THE CORRECTNESS OF FACT X (that the US government conspired to kill MLK). All of those paragraphs in the news articles that mention this are totally irrelevant to the correctness of Fact X. These paragraphs are included in order to create the false impression that Fact X is less correct because it was established in a civil trial than it would be if it were established in a criminal trial. This crucial and ubiquitous misrepresentation cannot be an mistake, and it would be interesting to find out what excuse various editors would give for this "mistake." Where did it originate?

Now to the second point, which involves the difference between (non-binding) "legal facts" (facts found or established in the course of a trial) and "true facts." Here you contradict yourself mightily.

On the one hand, you say legal facts can be untrue for all the reasons you mentioned last time, and that therefore "legal cases and their findings of fact are not the best repositories of truth and falsity." The more I think about it, the less sense this makes. By the same token, you can say that the verdicts are just as subject to falsity as "facts," and inevitably so, since they can only be as true as the facts they are based on. You might as well dismiss the entire legal system as worthless and meaningless. I doubt that you are prepared to do that.

On the other hand, you give us two examples of non-binding legal facts that you say can safely be taken as true, precisely because they were established as such, i.e., as facts in a trial (whether civil or criminal). You say that from Finck's testimony in the Garrison trial "we can conclude, and logically and safely, but not as a matter of binding law, that the U.S. government through its agents obstructed justice." You say that the abortion of the autopsy by military command is "a fact established in a failed prosecution."

Now, if this fact, and such a conclusion, can be established in a failed prosecution, surely such facts and conclusion are even more compelling if established by the side that wins the case. The Kings won the case, so the evidence they presented is certainly more credible than it would have been if they had lost.

In the Simpson case, you say that since the fact that he killed two people was found, though non-binding, you "can say with assurance that O.J. Simpson was found guilty by a civil jury of killing two persons." I think you are grossly misstating this, which is surprising given the distinctions you are insisting on. I think you mean he was found guilty of causing financial damage to the families ("wrongful death?"), not for murder, but that nevertheless, the fact that he committed the murders was established convincingly. Indeed, it was so convincingly established that it led you to make this slip and say that he was "found guilty" of murder, which of course he was not.

You say the O.J. analogy is inapt because he was a party to the litigation. You are implying that the fact that O.J. did it, though not legally binding, is more credible than it would have been if he had not been a litigant, because as a litigant he can defend himself. Ok, that seems logical. I suppose that means, then, that the fact that he did it is more credible than the fact that Nicole and Mark (if I recall the name correctly) knew each other, since that fact was established without their testimony. But even if this is true, the fact that Mark and Nicole knew each other is a credible fact, and it is more credible for having been established in a court of law than if the claim had only been made in newspapers, magazines, or books.

So which is it? Are (non-binding) legal facts more likely to be true, or accepted by the general public as true, than facts presented, for example, in publications, or are they not? I think you have answered my question, now, overwhelmingly in the affirmative, especially with the example of the Finck testimony.

You did not address my third point, which also concerns the significance of Fact X, which you deny. How often in American legal history has it been established in a judge's verdict–though in a non-binding manner–that the US conspired to murder

someone, much less a revered popular leader? I will do this search as soon as I get to an American law library. I don't think it will be difficult.

Likewise, one could search out all the cases that establish as non-binding legal facts that the government obstructed justice. I would love to have such a list. But I don't believe I'll find this in the Shaw verdict. Does it state as a (non-legally binding) fact that the government obstructed justice? That, and only that, would make it parallel with the Jowers verdict, with the difference that with Jowers we are talking about conspiracy to murder.

I am not "trying to do" anything with the Jowers trial except see it for what it is, namely a very important message from the King family and the US government. I've put it different ways, but try this: HERE'S YOUR TRUTH; JUSTICE YOU'LL HAVE TO GET YOURSELF.

To me, Vince, this message is transparent, and I believe it will be transparent to many (especially black) people. If you don't see it, you don't see it. I think it is at least as clear here as it was in Dealey Plaza.

This reinforces my long-standing impression, Vince, that you know something that you are not telling us. I have said this before, but I'll say it again. If you are right, especially about the transparency theory, as I believe you are, the CIA or some other agency has certainly long since assigned someone to your case. The purpose would be damage, i.e., truth, control. You can say what you like, as long as you don't say it too loudly.

I will be completely frank. You started this Newman/Turner wild goose chase immediately after I started to press you on the MLK thing, and your "lectures" on the law in this case seem so myopic to me that I can't help wondering if you are doing this under pressure, to create a diversion. If anyone else but you had started this "agent chasing," Marty would have screamed bloody murder. It is totally inconsistent with Marty's position regarding false and useless debates that he would approve of this latest "project" of yours. What could be more useless and a waste of time than trying to nail Newman and Turner as agents, and why would you choose to pursue them instead of much more important figures like Chomsky, Cockburn, Howard Zinn, etc.?

Your behavior here reminds me of the way Chomsky acted at the end of our correspondence–not wishing to "waste his time" pursuing insignificant points such as the withdrawal plan. In your case it is the Jowers verdict. Here you have Fact X in your hands and refuse to acknowledge its significance.

Let me restate the significance of Fact X in your own words:

As in the Simpson case, because of the Jowers verdict we "can say with assurance" that the US government conspired to murder MLK.

As in the Shaw case, it is "established fact," and "we can conclude logically and safely, but not as a matter of binding law," that the US government conspired to murder MLK.

The only point you have not yet conceded is that the Jowers verdict is the first time in American legal history that the US government has been found to be guilty, though "not as a matter of binding law," of conspiracy to murder anyone, much less a revered popular leader.

I say this from pure intuition, but you are in a position to verify it. Instead of that, you tell me I am completely wrong, that the Jowers verdict has no significance, that I am

wasting your time, and that it is far more important to examine pages and pages of quotations from Turner's and Newman's books so that we can speculate on the question of whether or not they are agents, which is unanswerable and which we have all pretty much made up our minds on anyway. This sounds to me like your watchdog barking. If it is, I think you should request a smarter watchdog. This is below your level. [*Re-reading this, I must apologize for what I now see as an attack of paranoia. I'm leaving it in, though, to demonstrate Vince's great patience and generosity in dealing with such an unfounded and unfair suspicion on my part. --MDM]*

VS (1/12/99)

I cannot spare the time to provide a full answer to your recent post, Mike. I will try to provide some short answers.

A "fact" found in any court may or may not be a fact as defined by dictionaries. In short, it may or may not be something which is true and actually happened. Courts are constantly finding as fact matters which are not true. Therefore, if you are a skeptical person, you will make up your own mind about the truth or falsity of a fact and give very little weight to whether a judge or jury found the matter to be a fact.

Yes, a fact in a criminal case is no less and no more correct than a fact found in a civil case. But, the media are not in error in concluding that the finding of responsibility of the U.S. government in the Jowers case is not the same as a finding of the U.S. government guilty in a criminal case. As I have said, a civil case verdict requires only a preponderance of evidence, and a guilty verdict requires guilt beyond a reasonable doubt.

With respect to the second point about non-binding "legal facts." No fact found at any trial can legally bind any non-party. A fact found at a trial may or may not be a fact in fact, i.e. true. If my statement that "legal cases and their findings of fact are not the best repositories of truth and falsity" makes no sense to you, then I must conclude that you have not spent, as I have, much time around courts. No, I do not choose to dismiss the entire legal system. I would not like the military to run the judicial system. You don't doubt that I am prepared to do that, but please recognize that I am as a lawyer an officer of the courts, and a rather successful practitioner in them. I love the litigation game. But I do not delude myself that courts are places where the truth necessarily prevails. Many of the cases I win, I suspect are won not by virtue of the forcefulness of my legal arguments and the quality of my legal skills, but that the judges and/or the juries like me. Some of the cases I have lost, I strongly suspect, were the consequence of my not having been appreciated by the judges or juries. So much for depending on a court to tell us what is true and what is false.

I provided you with examples of non-binding legal facts that you can rely on with some degree of assurance that they are true. Finck was under oath, and Garrison was not shy about charging liars with perjury. I was trying to lend you some support for believing some facts that emanate from a trial and showing you that the verdict is inconsequential with respect to the truth or falsity of the facts.

I did not misstate that the O.J. Simpson jury found him "guilty" of murder. They concluded that he had murdered two people, and they rendered a verdict of damages against him for "wrongful death." But there would have been no "wrongful death" verdict, if they had not found him guilty of having murdered two people.

The fact that Nicole and Mark knew one another is a fact that was known to the world prior to the trial. It is made no more nor no less credible by the civil trial findings.

I don't know the answer to fact X, where the American legal history reveals that a judge's verdict concluded that the US conspired to murder someone. So I cannot provide an answer for you. I personally know of none other than the Jowers case.

I agree that you accurately convey what the King family was trying to accomplish through the Jowers trial, i.e. a statement of HERE'S YOUR TRUTH; JUSTICE YOU'LL HAVE TO GET YOURSELF.

When the verdict came out, and Joe Stimmins exulted to us, I wrote him that I shared his joy. But, I thought that we should not overstate the meaning of the trial. Therefore, I set forth the legal problems we would be confronted with in seeking to convey to others the meaning of the trial. You informed me that Posner was making similar arguments. Well, I feel that my legal arguments are cautions which we should observe in order not to appear irresponsible. If Posner offered the same arguments, so be it.

The Newman/Turner "wild goose chase" was started, because I wanted some helpful criticism. My motivation for this work is as follows. As the Warren Report lost its credibility and therefore value as a fig leaf for the national security state, the force behind the killing retreated to its next prepared defense which was already in place. Government agents, parading as assassination critics, will have written material which supported a conspiratorial killing of Kennedy which did not rise to the institutional levels of the U.S. military-intelligence power structure. We therefore should be prepared to expose a Mafia-Robert Kennedy-anti-Castro-low-level-CIA-blow-back conspiracy as an effort to strip the Kennedy assassination from any historical meaning against our warfare state.

Mike, you consider this swatting flies. I consider this at the cutting edge of the hard work that must be done in order to bear witness to the truth in the killing of JFK.

You state that the question of whether Turner and Newman are agents is unanswerable. I think that we can answer definitively that Turner and Newman have been actively involved in work that defends the legitimacy of our warfare state apparatus and exculpates the national security state from systemic guilt in the killing of Kennedy. I think that we can safely predict what the next line of defense will be for the warfare state when the phony debate about whether or not the Warren Commission Report is truthful has pretty much run its course.

I have told you what I think the meaning of the Jowers case can safely be said to be. You do with my information or not do with it whatever you please. I am not dictating to you on this matter.

Mike, when lawyers say they are going to be brief, they lie.

VS (1/12/2000)

Here is the beginning of a fly-swatting project of mine. Feel free to edit and criticize. There is still much to do in this project. I will try in this effort to spell out for you what I think has been happening in this group. I know that some of you think that we are going to pieces. But I disagree. I think that we have been doing real work. It is not work that many will understand. But I think that it is important for those among us who are interested in bearing witness to the truth rather than building a sense of community and trying not to irritate, such as that damned fool clerk you used to have sought to achieve.

Here follows the second draft of Vince's remarks on Newman's Oswald and the CIA which became the review in his (see) letter of 1/31/2000.

MM *(*1/13/2000)

I think Vince and I have shot our respective wads re the Jowers verdict for the time being, so I'll drop it.

VS (1/13/2000)

Let us now try to focus on Owen's point and try to work out some agenda for the group. I can recall a course I had in group dynamics. It was a year-long course. There was no course syllabus, no text books, no reading list. About eight graduate students sat with an auditor. There was a one-way screen from which we were observed by students whom we did not know and who sat in a separate room. The auditor hardly said a word.

I have never witnessed such barbarism. We verbally beat the crap out of one another. It was then that I recognized my need for work structure. Without specific tasks to accomplish, the tendency for people to turn on one another is overwhelming. Have you ever been a member of a swim club for a summer? I have. In such a setting one can learn about clique structure and verbal battering and abuse. Well e-mail correspondence undirected by specific tasks can be an electronic equivalent of a swim club.

So, Owen, thank you for the advice.

As for the Newman material I sent you, Marty describes it, I think fairly, as turgid. I will continue with it and seek to make it less turgid. But, I trust that you understand that it is meant for only a few sophisticates who happen to share my curious point of view about where the U.S. government is going to protect the institutions of our society against criticism for having accepted the killing of President Kennedy and what that acceptance means.

I would really appreciate your negative criticism of this work in progress.

MM (1/14/2000)

Vince, lawyers aren't the only ones. When I said I was dropping the Jowers topic, I also lied. I have no intention of dropping it, especially not now that I know that at least two other people, namely Joe and Owen, are also interested.

As I said I think Vince and I have shot our wads on that subject, but I believe that if you read the letters carefully you will see that Vince has virtually conceded all three of my points, as much as I suppose any lawyer can concede anything. The last one remains to be proved–and any one of you can beat me to it (please feel free) because I do not have access to an American law library here in Germany–but Vince concedes that Jowers is the only case he knows of where "a judge's verdict concluded that the US conspired to murder someone."

Now, if that is not hugely significant–if it is true, as Vince implies, that we are just as likely to find all sorts of crazy and untruthful things in judge's verdicts–then I'll eat my hat. I can't believe I can be the only one pointing these things out.

But I couldn't believe I was the only person that doubted the Herrhausen story, either. I wasn't, because Fletch had whispered it in my ear, but as it turns out, I believe I was the first person to write about it (*Lies of Our Times*, 1990).

On Dec. 8, 1989, Fletch wrote to me:

The murder of the Deutsche Bank president, Alfred Herrhausen, is one of the most important events of this age, like the JFK murder. Coming as it did as the Eastern European movement is underway, as plans for 1992 are firming up, and on the threshold

of the Malta conference, it was a well-planned murder by professionals. The New York Times today, Dec. 8, 1989, has an article entitled "Terrorist Victim's European Vision" as they review a speech he would have made before the American Council on Germany in New York last Monday.

We may be assured that he was not killed by terrorists. He was the victim of top level pressures and an enemy of the City and all that London stands for today. Deutsche Bank, in my book, is the most powerful financial institution in the world. The City did not like him and his ascending policies.

May I ask a favor? See if you can get a copy of that speech from Frankfurt. It is bound to be as valuable a statement of our time, as the speech planned by JFK for Nov. 22, 1963, in Dallas. I would like to read it in its entirety. You just watch, that murder struck an enormous blow against Germany and the world. I have nothing to go on except the "cui bono" fact. I would study every shred of that bomb to see how it was done, and by whom from across the channel.

I sent Fletch the articles and did a little more research, which resulted in my 1990 article. I remember feeling a little guilty at the time for not mentioning Fletch in the article, but I don't think he minded, and he had not written anything on it.

The next thing I hear, just a few weeks ago, from a student, having boastfully observed to them that I am the only person to have published anything doubting the "RAF did it" story, is that there is a book that says the same thing: Gerhard Wisnewski et al., *Das RAF-Phantom* (Knaur).

I buy the book and see that it is the second edition, 1997. The first was 1992, two years after my article, which is mentioned nowhere in the book or the bibliography.

In the book (p. 190), Wisnewski quotes Prouty, as quoted in the German LaRouche organ *Solidarität* (run by his wife, who is German) in July 1992, saying pretty much what he said to me in his letter, minus the implication of "London's" role. Wisnewski points out, fairly enough I suppose, that some people suspect that Fletch has LaRouche affiliations.

Then I take another look at the Prouty site, and I see a letter (unfortunately undated) from Wisnewski to Prouty asking for his opinion on terrorism and cases like Herrhausen. Fletch replied (also undated):

I have done a lot of work on the Herrhausen murder and will enclose a brief item written by a friend of mine. We had corresponded on the subject, and my ideas agree with his. There is much more that could be said. I am enclosing a copy of Prof. Morressey's [sic] article. I possess a complete copy of the speech Herrhausen was going to deliver in New York City as the Arthur Burns Memorial Lecture on Dec 4, 1989 less than a week after his murder in Germany. It is a most important bit of writing. You should look in the files of that period for the article published by the *New York Times* that widely altered the speech for its own purposes. This act by a leading newspaper deserves much research and study.

Attached to that letter was my 1990 *Lies Of Our Times* article, dated June 1, 1990, followed by a note saying I teach at "Kessel [sic] University."

Now, despite the misspelling of my name and the name of my university (Kassel)–as I wrote to Wisnewski–a competent journalist would surely have been able to track me down easily enough. Furthermore, since Fletch sent paper, he must have sent a

photocopy of the published article, which had the name of the journal and the correct spellings on it.

So I write to Wisnewski and mention my article. He doesn't remember either my name or the article. I write him again attaching Owen's web page with Wisnewski's letter, Fletch's reply, and my article. Here is my letter of 12/23/99 and his reply of the same day:

Dear Mr. Wisnewski,

I attach a copy of your letter to Fletch Prouty and his reply to you with my 1990 article from *Lies Of Our Times* enclosed.

Yet you tell me you can't remember me. Is it because my name was misspelled ("Morressey") on the website, and the name of my university ("Kessel")? Surely a competent journalist like yourself would have been able to track me down nonetheless!

Sincerely,

Michael Morrissey

Dear Mr. Morrissey,

Am I wrong or is there a certain hostile touch in your last e-mail? Do you really think that I remember every author of every thousands of documents/articles which I read during the research several years ago? Even if it is wrong spelled as you realized by yourself? Do you think that I now searched my archive for finding a Mr. Morrissey due to our e-mail conversation? Excuse me but I did not.

I am sometimes interested in a e-mail conversation on RAF-subjects, but in a constructive way. If you are ready for this you are welcome. Otherwise please don't write to me again.

Sincerely,

Gerhard Wisnewski

I decided that if this guy is determined to be a prick there's nothing I can do about it. You can't put a patent on ideas. I suppose you could also say I stole the idea from Fletch–and did he get it from somewhere? Still, stealing orally transmitted ideas is not the same as stealing published ideas–and I am convinced that is exactly what Wisnewski did. The documents themselves prove it, and his reaction to me confirms it.

MM (1/16/2000)

Joe, in case you do get a chance to ask Carol Hewlitt or another lawyer, here's how I would summarize the results of my discussion with Vince:

1. Contrary to the implications in the media, facts established in a civil case are no less correct than facts established in a criminal case.

That means that all of the references to the difference between "preponderance of evidence" and evidence "beyond a reasonable doubt" in the Jowers verdict are not only completely irrelevant, but also misleading, and probably purposely so in most cases. Fact X (that the US government was involved in a conspiracy to murder MLK) would be no more or less correct than it would be if it had been a criminal trial. Vince seems to agree with me here.

2. To what extent can facts established in (either civil or criminal) trials, although not legally binding to anyone, be taken as true facts?

Vince says not at all. I beg to differ. I believe that such facts have more importance, that is, are generally more readily accepted as facts by the public, than facts established in other contexts (e.g., in publications). Vince contradicts himself with his own example of the Finck testimony in the Shaw trial, which Vince says establishes it as

a (non-legally binding) fact the US government obstructed justice in aborting the JFK autopsy.

3. Has the US government ever been named as a conspirator to murder anyone, much less a beloved popular leader, in the verdict of any court in the United States (civil, criminal, state, city, or federal), even though this fact is not legally binding on the US government? To put it differently, has this proposition ever been treated as a fact and explicitly stated in the verdict of a judge and jury, even though it is not legally binding on the US government?

Vince repeatedly understood this question as "Has the US government ever been named as a party in a legal case as a conspirator in the death of anyone?", inserting "as a party" into it, which changes it to "Has the US ever been tried for murder or conspiracy to murder?" (in a US court). I think I finally made it clear, though, that that was not the question I was asking.

In his last letter Vince admits that Jowers is the only case he knows about where this has happened. This is the question I thought would not be difficult to research.

Re German politicians, they're as corrupt here as anywhere, as the latest scandal with Kohl shows, but there's big difference in the way sexual matters are handled, and there is in general much less show biz. I think that to most of the rest of the world the American obsession with sex appears extremely juvenile, or puritanical, or in any case highly exaggerated. Not that the same things don't happen here, and I would say generally the same sexual mores prevail, but they just don't make such a fuss about it. This Monica Lewinsky circus was truly incomprehensible, I think, for Germans, even my students.

MM (1/16/2000)

Vince, you asked for "negative criticism" of your Newman comments. I did not mean to give you the impression before, by the way, that I thought your work on Newman was worthless. Swatting flies was in contrast to having the dragon by the tail (in the Jowers case), i.e. just hyperbole and not meant to be insulting.

On the contrary, I think it is useful for people who need to understand how Newman's work exonerates the government, and are willing to understand it. But how are you going to make them willing to understand it? In other words, I don't think you are going to convince anybody that isn't predisposed to agree with you in the first place.

Correct as you are in what you say, I think it is more significant that Newman predicted his conclusion–that the CIA et al. as institutions were innocent–at the COPA meeting in 1996, before he had completed the research! I challenged him on this in my public letter to him, but he never responded.

What is Newman doing that Chomsky and Posner are not doing? These are the two ends and middle of the same stick–that there was and is no high-level conspiracy involving the government. That the government was not involved even though certain rogue elements of the government may have been involved. That the government is therefore still legitimate, basically well-intentioned, and not the enemy. This is the essence of what all three of these people say about the assassination. And how far away is our own John Thomas from this position, or the rest of us for that matter?

What interests me is their motivation, and in that respect I find Chomsky and John much more interesting subjects than Newman. It is easy to see Newman as a blind or half-blind patriot, much more difficult with John and Chomsky.

VS (1/19/2000)

This is the third draft of Vince's review of Newman's Oswald and the CIA (see his letter of 1/31/2000.)

MM *(*1/20/2000)

Vince, here is a hypothetical answer from Newman to your review:

Dear Mr. Salandria,

Please not waste my time asking me to expound on something I know so much more about than you do. Why should I respond to ad hominem attacks and speculative interpretations of the findings presented in my book? You are free to conclude what you wish. They are your conclusions, not mine.

I would like to quote Michael Parenti, however, a scholar for whom I understand you have some respect, who replied on behalf of the COPA board to a similar attack on my person by a jerk named Michael Morrissey in 1994 (I will substitute your name for his.)

I just want to take issue with the suspicion you entertain that John might still be working for the powers that be. Such suspicions add nothing to your critique of his argument about renegades and they point us down a slippery road. One could play that game with you: What would serve the CIA more than to enlist someone as sharp as Salandria to take out Newman, who is hated by his former military intelligence colleagues as a turncoat critic. It is odd that Salandria–under what better guise than purporting to be totally critical of the CIA and the intelligence community–salvages Chomsky's research, and creates divisive feelings and suspicions by casting doubt not only on Newman's argument but his integrity and motives, etc. etc.

There is an infinite regress to that mode of ad hominem suspicion. I have heard that Mark Lane is an agent and that Chomsky is also working for the Establishment under what better guise than acting as a high visibility critic of that very same Establishment, etc. etc. Everyone is fair game. All it does is create hard feelings and divisions while adding nothing to the substance of the investigation and debate.

This does not mean that provocateurs cannot be dealt with. Of course, if someone is causing trouble for everyone, sabotaging our organizational efforts, casting a kooky light on things, and doing the other things that undercover pigs do, then s/he should be publicly criticized. Even then, the question of whether s/he "is or isn't" and what motivates such a person is less relevant than the reality of what that individual is doing.

I met John Newman in Washington and liked him very much. I'm glad he's working my side of the street.

Concerning Chomsky, you attempt to extract from his use of the word "lucid" that he finds your highly speculative thesis of an ongoing "national security state" plot "rational." I refer you to *Rethinking Camelot* and other publications in which he has stated precisely the opposite. He said you presented a clearly understandable ("lucid") statement of what YOU believe. I'm sure there are people who could make a lucid presentation of the thesis that space aliens have landed on earth as well, and perhaps even that they are in charge of the "national security state." I can only tell you that in twenty years of intelligence work I never saw anyone with more than one head on his shoulders.

You say that from the evidence I presented, "in any courtroom, one could prove to the satisfaction of any disinterested judge or jury that Oswald was a U.S. intelligence operative."

I would like to remind you of what you, as a practicing attorney, should know better than I–that all manner of untruths, lies, and wild speculations can be found as "facts" in a courtroom, and that they cannot be taken as true facts. They are only legal facts, "true" only inasmuch as they apply to the finding of guilt or innocence of the accused. For example, the recent Jowers verdict "found" the US government guilty of participating in a conspiracy to kill Martin Luther King. This is not a fact, and has no significance whatever outside of the Jowers trial, because the US government was not a litigant in the case.

Need I remind you that being a "U.S. intelligence operative" is not a crime? Am I a criminal because I worked for Army intelligence and the NSA? What kind of courtroom are you envisioning here? Perhaps a kangaroo type?

But let us assume you could put Oswald on trial in the same way as Jowers. The charge would be participating in a conspiracy to murder JFK. Perhaps you could prove this conspiracy existed, as in the Jowers case. Perhaps you could prove that the U.S. government was involved in this conspiracy, as in the Jowers case. Perhaps you could prove that Oswald was involved in this conspiracy, as in the Jowers case. Perhaps you could also prove that Oswald was a witting participant in the conspiracy, as in the Jowers case (though I explicitly stated that Oswald may have been unwitting).

Perhaps you could convince a jury and judge of all this, and produce a verdict that would, for the second time in American legal history (after Jowers), state that the U.S. government conspired to murder someone, who happened in this case to be the president. You should know, as an attorney, that such a finding is not a legally binding fact and that it therefore has absolutely no status whatsoever as truth and also therefore has no significance whatsoever for the public, for history, or for any other purpose than that particular trial in which the U.S. government cannot be found guilty or innocent of anything whatsoever because the U.S. government was not a litigant in the case.

Judges and juries can be persuaded of all kinds of crazy and untrue things, for all sorts of reasons that may have nothing at all to do with the true facts. Therefore, your statement that Oswald could be found guilty in a courtroom of being an intelligence operative is, first of all, false–since working for the government is not a crime–and secondly, totally vacuous, since even proving to a judge and jury that he participated in a government conspiracy to murder the president would NOT prove that there was such a conspiracy or that the government was involved in it.

Respectfully,

"JN"

MM (1/22/2000)

John, I think your letter is interesting and should be discussed. I think it expresses openly and honestly what you are feeling, and I believe wholeheartedly in that. I assume you are willing to accept the open and honest expression of feelings by the rest of us in return. That is what we are here for, in my opinion. We are indeed delving rather deeply into one another's most cherished beliefs, and that is not something that should not be taken lightly.

This e-mail business can get to you. It is not a sideline. It can be trivial, and often is, but what we are doing is far from trivial. We are having very serious conversations in which we invest a lot of emotional energy. We can hurt ourselves and others, even seriously. It is easy to forget this in cyberspace, where all we have is words to

communicate, but we should all make a special effort not to. Sorry for preaching, I have not been ordained yet. But if you remember, I said something similar at the very beginning–that we were all walking a very thin line between paranoia and denial.

Paranoia and denial are pathological states of mind, and when I say we are walking a thin line between them, I mean that for some (or most) of our fellow Americans, we are all paranoid, seeing conspiracies in the government and all around us. For others, if we deny these conspiracies, or if our take on the nature of the conspiracy (-ies) does not coincide fully with theirs, we are in denial. That is the line we are walking.

I also said at the beginning that we should look at ourselves as a support group. Pitiful as that sounds, I think it is more realistic than thinking of ourselves as some sort of vanguard. We are not going to agree on any kind of political action. Not at the moment in any case. We should limit ourselves to trying to understand each other, and helping each other if possible. Arguing can be helpful if it can be done without inflicting mortal wounds, but anybody who thinks cyberspace is not dangerous because it's only words is wrong as hell.

But now I need to say a word or two in defense of Marty and Vince (and myself). John, you may underestimate the degree to which we feel alienated from the U.S. government. Just step back a moment and think about how Marty and Vince must relate to their own families and friends, colleagues, and the world in general around them. How many people do you think will even talk with them about these things, much less accept the way they feel? They may have a dominant position in this group–but remember there are only 6 or 7 of us participating–and in any larger group they (we) would be totally ostracized.

I have a big advantage in that I live in Germany and do not have to face the "normal" knee-jerk patriotism of the horde. I would have to deal with it more if I attacked "Germany," which I admit I normally refrain from, partly for precisely that reason, and also because I still feel much more like an American than a German. When I was giving talks against the Gulf War, somebody in the audience asked me if I would say the same things in the States, and I said yes, but maybe I was being a little overconfident. If you consider the position that Vince, and I suppose Marty, have taken over all these years, and consider the enormous amount of opposition, hatred, ridicule, etc. that they must have had to face in maintaining their views, it is easier to understand that now they are no longer willing to be patient with what they see as a mind-set which has been militating against them for many years. It is much, much easier, John, to take your position than theirs, especially in the U.S.

VS (1/24/2000)

John, I cannot agree with you that this group is being mind-numbed. I see the group as on task, expressing thoughts on the assassination of JFK at a high level which I cannot find matched elsewhere. I would ask you and Gary to invite Professor Newman to join the discussion and to answer my book review and challenge to him. In the absence of his interest, then I will ask John Kelin to put this review in the Internet publication, and if you so choose, to have your answer and that of Gary to the piece included also.

Owen, I do not consider Fletcher Prouty an agent. I have spoken to this question before you joined the correspondence. But, in the future, I may do a belated book review on Fletcher's *The Secret Team*.

MM (1/25/2000)

I attach a page from WebCrawler, a search engine, which seems to be a good starting point for legal research, but I have no idea how to proceed. I am hoping one of you may have some idea how to research the question whether the US government has ever been named as a conspirator to murder in a case where it is not a litigant (as in the Jowers case).

I would also like to collect some examples of false, untrue, crazy, etc. facts that have been similarly established in courts of law. This would support Vince's argument that establishing the (non-legally binding) fact that the US government conspired to murder MLK is no more significant than many other false (non-binding) facts found in court cases. If this is true, than the larger question of how significant this (non-binding) fact can be to the public is also answered.

VS (1/25/2000)

Sorry, Mike, I do not have the expertise to help you.

VS (1/28/2000)

I would differ with you, Joe and Marty, on one point. The hundreds or thousands of items of detail which Newman provides are not designed to help the critical community. Quite to the contrary, what I am saying that Professor Newman is doing to the critical community is this. He is stating that he is the expert on whether Oswald was a CIA operative. Then he provides us with a mountain of evidence to the effect that he was. But he then says: "Wait a minute, you nuts. You cannot conclude from these data that Oswald was a CIA agent. I am a professor and know how to prove a point. If I cannot conclude from this massive evidence that Oswald was a CIA agent, neither can you."

Now, among all responsible critics, it has long been known as a fact that Oswald was a CIA agent. I realized he was a CIA agent from reading newspaper accounts immediately after the assassination. That led to Harold Feldman's article wrongly entitled "Oswald and the FBI" which appeared in *The Nation* in 1963. The standard of proof that Newman holds us up to is impossible to attain. He wants us to come up with a party card for Oswald. Oh, you know what I mean by a party card. He wants a specific paper trail showing the indicia of employment. For example a specific employment number, pay stubs, reports filed by Oswald with the Agency, etc. Any intelligence agency that would allow such material on Oswald to remain in existence would not be very intelligent.

So, rather than helping the critics, Professor Newman only appears to be identifying with them. As a member of their team he sets them back where they have to prove something which they already have proved. He then sets a new standard of proof which is impossible to obtain.

But, that is not to say that he does not change roles and become a conclusion jumper without benefit of evidence, if the conclusions help the government, e.g., if he concludes that the CIA could not have been institutionally involved in killing Kennedy.

VS (1/31/2000)

A Belated Book Review Followed by a Challenge to Professor John Newman, author of *Oswald and the CIA* (New York: Carroll & Graf, 1995). [*This was later published on the internet, e.g. http://www.prouty.org/vince.html. --MDM*]

On the History Channel, Professor John Newman, in late November, 1999, stated: "The idea of a high level, institutional plot with the CIA to kill John Kennedy is crazy." That statement of Professor Newman succinctly sums up the thrust of Professor Newman's Book, *Oswald and the CIA*. From this review, I trust that the reader will

conclude that Mr. Newman's book demonstrates that his thesis is clearly wrong, and that the thesis which he designated as "crazy" is in fact not crazy but lucid.

I will review Professor John Newman's *Oswald and the CIA* by means of quoting directly from the text and then setting forth what I interpret Professor Newman to be telling his readers. For purposes of providing you with what this reviewer conceives as Professor Newman's meaning, your reviewer chooses to employ the first person singular and purports to be speaking as Professor Newman. However, in the conclusion of this review, the reviewer speaks for himself to Professor Newman.

This reviewer interprets Professor Newman's book as serving to deny any rationality to the conclusion that there was an institutional-national security state conspiracy to kill President John F. Kennedy. This reviewer reads Professor's Newman's book to state that there is no proof that Lee Harvey Oswald was a U.S. intelligent agent. This reviewer deems both of the above-stated propositions as amply proven by prior research and writings. Indeed, this reviewer submits that the very intelligence material supplied by Professor Newman in this book at least compels the conclusion that Oswald was a U.S. intelligence agent. I submit that the conclusion is proven by Professor Newman's setting forth the intelligence material on Oswald–-those files which are extant and have been released and by his pointing out the Oswald intelligence files conveniently or more likely necessarily declared by the intelligence agencies to be missing. By seeking to deny Oswald's obvious U.S. intelligence connection, Professor Newman appears to want to prevent the reader from drawing the conclusion that the CIA was institutionally involved in the killing of President Kennedy. This conclusion of high-level CIA involvement in Kennedy's assassination flows naturally from Oswald's role as a U.S. intelligence operative.

This reviewer will now set forth below verbatim quotes from Professor Newman's book with the pertinent page references. These excerpts are followed by first-person singular commentary. These comments represent the reviewer's assessment of what the passages quoted from Professor Newman's book are designed to convey to the reader.

[Dedication] To the men and women who served the CIA with distinction and made possible the Agency's greatest accomplishments; and to the courageous citizens who dared to investigate the Agency's greatest failures.

I am John Newman. I have spent 20 years in military intelligence. I do not have to explain why I who spent so many years in U.S. intelligence work am undertaking to explore the Kennedy assassination which around the globe is commonly thought by many to be the work of U.S. intelligence. I won't explain to you whether, as is common to intelligence work, I am duty bound by an oath to be loyal to U.S. intelligence. I am now an academic. As an academic steeped in the craft of intelligence, you can trust me to be able to interpret accurately intelligence documents and to assess the work of intelligence agencies with far more expertise than the reader.

The CIA has accomplished great things. Of course, it has had failures. Failures do not constitute deliberate, premeditated killings of innocents throughout the world. If you choose to investigate the CIA, and restrict yourself to its mistakes or failures, I consider you a courageous citizen. On the other hand, should you dare to explore evidence and interpret it as demonstrating that the CIA is a covert organization which deliberately kills innocents here and abroad, including governmental and civic leaders, then we have little to say to one another.

Acknowledgements [p. vii-ix]: ...Paul Hoch, Bernard Fensterwald, Jr….Richard Helms...Priscilla Johnson…Gerry Hemming, James Hosty...Nicholas Anikeeff...with whom I conducted formal interviews or background discussion.

Please note that I acknowledge the assistance in writing my book of the following persons: CIA personnel, an FBI agent who destroyed a communication sent to the FBI by Oswald prior to the assassination, a critic who has sought to sanitize mounds of data which incriminate the national security state, and a deceased critic who created a suspect committee, the Committee to Investigate Assassinations (CIA).

Thanks for the Support of Friends in Our Intelligence Agencies

(p. x) To my many friends and former colleagues in the National Security Agency, the Central Intelligence Agency, the Defense Intelligence Agency, and the Army Intelligence and Security Command, and you know who you are: Thanks for your words of encouragement or constructive criticism, whatever they happened to be.

I still have many friends and former colleagues in the National Security Agency, the Central Intelligence Agency, and the Army Intelligence and Security Command. I thank them for encouraging me and offering constructive criticism. I trust these people. If I thought that the agencies which they serve, and to which they are sworn to be loyal might have been involved in the killing of President John F. Kennedy, I would not have had them assist me in this work. Therefore, I stand behind these friends and their intelligence agencies as necessarily innocent of any roles in the killing of Kennedy and its cover-up. Those persons who believe that U.S. intelligence was actively and institutionally involved in the killing of JFK and in covering up their role in the killing are not to be found in my acknowledgements, because such a concept is crazy. As a careful academic researcher I have stated most recently that the evidence to date does not convince me that there was or was not any conspiracy to kill President Kennedy. Therefore, insofar as we cannot know whether there was or was not a conspiracy, how can anyone rationally conclude that the killing of JFK was the conspiratorial work of the national security state?

Most of the people who work in CIA operations are decent and honorable Americans. The Agency has made mistakes not because covert actions are the very antithesis of democracy which posits an informed citizenry, but because some bad apples are to be found among them. I make mention of mistakes that our intelligence agencies may have made. I make no mention and do not concede the plausibility of premeditated and deliberate slaughter of hundreds of thousands by the CIA and other U.S. intelligence agencies in overthrowing governments, in training and assisting death squads, and in designing our entry into and expansion of the Vietnam War. The CIA and other intelligence institutions worked well during the period when JFK was killed, but they made mistakes. Perhaps we can require of them now that they be somewhat more open to public scrutiny. But that is not to say our intelligence agencies are systemically flawed and have not in the past, do not in the present, and will not in the future well serve our nation in maintaining our superpower status.

My Purpose–Restoring Faith in Our Institutions

(p. xiii) The purpose of the JFK Assassination Records Act was to take a step in the direction of restoring faith. The premise underlying this step is simple: Opening up all the government's files will demonstrate that our institutions work today.

The JFK Assassination Records Act was designed to restore faith in our government. Please note that I make no mention of truth-seeking as one of its purposes. Let me assure you that the U.S. government, by revealing all the data of the killing of JFK, will demonstrate that its intelligence agencies, could not have been institutionally involved in a design to kill the President. I can also assure you that a full disclosure of Kennedy assassination data could never accomplish a purpose counterposed to restoring faith in our government. Needless to say, full disclosure of all the documents related to the Kennedy assassination could never result in proving that our national security state institutions killed Kennedy to usurp foreign-policy functions which they today continue to exercise autonomously. Attributing institutional blame to the CIA in the killing of JFK is, I say again, crazy. For example, to point up the recent bombing of the Chinese Embassy in Belgrade–a CIA mistake–could not and should not be viewed as an example demonstrating that the CIA is capable of mendacious usurpation of foreign policy. The CIA in its role in the Chinese Embassy bombing cannot rationally be viewed as deliberately punishing the Chinese for conducting surveillance activities for the Serbs. This conclusion would be crazy. Although we have conceded that we ascertained that the Chinese were providing surveillance from their embassy, this was not why we bombed their embassy. The rational explanation for the bombing was that the CIA mistakenly used old maps for targeting its missiles. Any other explanation, as I have said, is irrational.

We must protect ourselves from entertaining irrational thoughts. My book is designed to accomplish effective and benign censorship so that we may regain our faith in our institutions. Erich Fromm referred in his book *On Disobedience* (The Seabury Press, N.Y., N.Y. 1961) to the "social unconscious":

This concept refers to that repression of inner reality which is common to large groups. Every society must make every effort not to permit its members, or those of a particular class, to be aware of impulses which if they were conscious, could lead to socially "dangerous" thoughts or actions. Effective censorship occurs, not at the level of the printed or spoken word, but by preventing thoughts from even becoming conscious, that is, by repression of dangerous awareness (p. 34).

So, I have called crazy the very concept which some isolated people maintain explain the Kennedy assassination. This is out of concern for maintaining our people's faith in our institutions and to prevent socially dangerous thoughts or actions evolving from the analysis of the killing of President Kennedy. I call the explanation of an institutional conspiracy crazy in order to warn the reader that to embrace such an understanding of the data will isolate the person who holds and expresses such a belief. And Erich Fromm tells us that

…individually and socially, man's greatest fear is that of complete isolation from his fellow men, of complete ostracism. Even fear of death is easier to bear. Society enforces its demands for repression by the threat of ostracism. If you do not deny the presence of certain experiences, you do not belong, you belong nowhere, your are in danger of becoming insane. (Insanity is, in fact, the illness characterized by total absence of relatedness to the world outside.) (Ibid. p. 35)

So, I am saving the reader from this fate worse than death by advising you of what are crazy thoughts which are not to be entertained. You are free to believe absent adequate proof that the assassination of President Kennedy was a conspiracy. But I will

not allow you to be declared rational, if you state that you can lucidly establish that President Kennedy was killed by an institutional conspiracy of our national security state.

CIA Had Operational Interest in Oswald

(p. xv) The thesis of this work holds that the CIA had a keen operational interest in Lee Harvey Oswald from the day he defected to the Soviet Union in 1959 until the day he was murdered in the basement of the Dallas city jail.... Secondly, whether witting or not, Oswald became involved in CIA operations.

I offered in my book hundreds or even thousands of items of evidence derived from official government documents which demonstrate that Oswald, from the time he was in the Marines, was a U.S. intelligence operative. From this evidence, you may feel that, in any courtroom, one could prove to the satisfaction of any disinterested judge or jury that Oswald was a U.S. intelligence operative. But I do not arrive at such a conclusion. And I am the keeper and interpreter of the intelligence documents and have been so acknowledged by the mainstream media. I am the quintessential expert who is most skilled in interpreting intelligence documents. Only I, and not you, can tell which conclusions you can draw from the massive evidence that I in my book paraded before you as to whether Oswald was a U.S. intelligence agent. I instruct you that I have not concluded, and therefore that you cannot conclude, from the data that I have presented that Oswald was a U.S. intelligence operative. Again, I remind you that I am the expert in this area of deciphering Oswald-related intelligence reports. Therefore, I know. You don't know. You can't know until or unless I tell you I know.

This Book Concludes Nothing Regarding Conspiracy in JFK's Killing

(p. xv) We will not address the assassination of President Kennedy. We will not discuss Dealey Plaza. This book is content to explore the subject of Oswald and the CIA without regard to who is right and who is wrong in the larger debate about the Kennedy assassination.

I wrote a book about Oswald and the CIA. But, I did not directly address the assassination of President Kennedy. I will not discuss Dealey Plaza. The book does not discuss who is right and who is wrong in the debate about whether the assassination was the work of a conspiracy. But I will tell you later that the CIA as an institution could not have been involved in planning and executing the Kennedy assassination. Later I will also tell you that I, an intelligent intelligence expert, do not have the necessary credentials to determine what happened in Dealey Plaza. And of course you don't even approach having the equal of my impressive credentials. Therefore, by necessary negative inference, you cannot pretend to know whether the killing of the President in Dealey Plaza was the work of a lone assassin or the consequence of a conspiratorial crossfire. Most certainly, you cannot rationally pretend to know who killed Kennedy and why.

Consequently, after thirty-six years may feel that the research on the Kennedy killing demonstrates to you that the single-bullet-lone-assassin concept is a deus ex machina designed to provide a fig leaf for a guilty national security state which wore no clothes. But I am instructing you that, irrespective of your conviction about the non-tenability of the single-bullet theory, the question of whether or not there was a conspiracy to kill Kennedy is still deemed by me as debatable. If conspiracy is an open question for me, perforce it must be for you. And just so long as you consider the issue of conspiracy to kill Kennedy as open, and the high-level institutional killing of Kennedy as closed, you can safely be included in the privileged herd. Reason with me, and you will

be safely identified with that herd of good citizens of an unquestionably democratic and constitutionally guided superpower.

After thirty-six Years of Painstaking Research We Cannot Know Who Killed Kennedy and Why

(p. 429-430) Of the many riddles we have attempted to solve in this book, the Dealey Plaza puzzle is not among them. The author lacks the requisite skills in ballistics, forensic pathology, photo and imagery interpretation, and criminal psychology, to name but a few. We need fewer studies that claim to have all the answers and more that focus on specific areas and are built on firm robust evidentiary foundations. The fact that the public has made several inaccurate guesses does not mean that their suspicions about the Warren commission conclusions are not justified.

To know what happened in Dealey Place you cannot rely on your experience as a hunter or a soldier or your familiarity with firing rifles. You cannot rely on what you know about whether a custom-made shirt and coat can ride up a back five inches when the wearer of the garments is waving his hand no higher than his shoulder height. You cannot infer anything from the fact that the shirt and coat holes are more than five inches down from the collars of the Kennedy garments. You cannot rely on secret service and independent observers in Dealey Plaza whose affidavits and testimony about the location of the wounds and the direction of the shots appeared to compel a conclusion of a multiple-assassin crossfire having killed the President.

Nor can you rely on the Zapruder film showing the President's body being snapped leftward and backward by a bullet impact delivered from the right front. You cannot rely on the Zapruder film which shows the President and Governor John Connolly being struck at separate times by separate bullets. You cannot rely on the bullet hits on the chrome of the President's limousine. You cannot rely on James T. Tague having been hit by a bullet strike when there were according to the government's theory no more than three bullets which caused all of the Dealey Plaza impacts. You cannot rely on the bullet designated by the Warren Commission as CE-399, which was found in Parkland Hospital, as having been most obviously planted by conspirators to implicate Oswald as the shooter. You cannot rely on the Parkland Hospital doctors having reported an entry wound in the neck of the President who had never turned his head so as to allow him to receive a frontal neck wound from a bullet fired from the rear of the President. You cannot rely on the Parkland Hospital doctor and nurses all having reported seeing a massive occipital wound in the President's head. You cannot rely on the fact that no one at Parkland Hospital had observed the necessary and the then-absent small hole in the back of the President's head. You cannot rely on FBI agents, Seibert and O'Neil, having reported that the autopsy demonstrated that the hit in the President's back had not exited.

You cannot rely on the thousands of items of evidence, any one of which proves a conspiracy, notwithstanding that, scientifically, probability theory requires that at least one of those items proving conspiracy is correct. Why cannot you rely on the science of probability theory? Because, notwithstanding the scientific constraints of probability theory, I refuse to rely on these data as conclusive of anything. I am an academic expert. Most certainly, you, who are not an expert, cannot be so presumptuous as to rely on science which runs counter to my conclusions.

Forget probability theory. To know what happened in Dealey Place you must have the requisite skills in ballistics, forensic pathology, photo and imagery

interpretation, and criminal psychology, to name but a few. We need fewer studies that claim to have all the answers. The truth of who killed Kennedy and why is not knowable thirty-six years after the event.

We need more studies on specific areas. There must be the same kind of division of labor as was employed in the Warren Commission so that you can point this way and that way to determine who has the responsibility for drawing any and which inferences from which particular fact. Should any one claim that the data drove us logically to the conclusion that the U.S. warfare state killed President Kennedy for Cold War purposes, that person must be declared irresponsible, unscientific, unschooled, and/or just plain crazy.

In fact, the data are overwhelming in driving us to just such a Cold War conclusion, but if you want access in this society you must never state that. After all, we have an establishment that can marginalize you should you wish to jump to compelling conclusions which will tend to embarrass our establishment.

Oh, it is true that scientists, in arriving at conclusions, do not endlessly gather facts. Rather, they conceive a model of explanation to make sense of the available data. Scientists then examine the data to see whether the model comports with the facts. If the model does not comport with the facts, then scientists revise or reject the model of explanation and fashion another model repeating the process of determining whether the new model adequately explains the data. When they come across a model which explains the facts, they speak of having arrived at scientific truth. That remains the truth until or unless the available data no longer confirm the validity of the model. Scientists do not just endlessly gather and examine facts independent of a model of explanation.

But I am directing you, if you wish to be responsible, to abandon science. Bury yourselves in "specific areas" of the research. Learn to love the individual facts. Proclaim that you deserve credit for having made the first discovery of a fact or group of facts. Dispute those who contest your priority of credit for being the first discoverer of a fact. But don't try to give meaning to a fact in the context of an overall model of explanation.

As I have said, we need fewer studies that claim to have all the answers, even if a model of explanation such as explaining the Kennedy assassination on a national security state institutional model explains all the data. It may explain the data, but you are not free to espouse such a model of scientific explanation. Should you do so, we will declare you to be crazy, and thereby marginalize you, and deny you access to the mainstream media.

The fact is that the public has made several inaccurate guesses about the assassination. It is a fact that the vast majority of the public, which in every public opinion poll has declared the Kennedy assassination to be a conspiracy, is involved in inaccurate guessing. It is a fact that the vast majority of the public has held such a view from the time of the Kennedy killing to the present. Yet our government, which purports to be democratic, and which has the most effective and best-funded investigation agencies in the world, has never been able to solve the great mystery of who killed him and why. But if the public could not know, and if the government and distinguished professors such as I cannot know, then the public is making inaccurate guesses. The public, after all, does not number among it a substantial proportion of many professors. Until the full academic community thoroughly explores the assassination, the public cannot claim to know the truth about the Kennedy assassination. While we treat the Kennedy killing as a great mystery, we can all remain safely encapsulated in the herd's

hunt for details of a murder mystery, and not have to rethink as responsible individuals the horrors committed by our national security state in its pursuit of its Cold War ends. Nor do we have to feel responsible for the crimes which our warfare state is now and will in the future be committing.

Oh, the public may have been accidentally right in having suspicions about the Warren Commission's conclusion. So, we are leaving open the possibility that there was a conspiracy to kill Kennedy. But, if there were a conspiracy, it had as its source some force below the highest levels of U.S. national security state power.

Possibly at some future date, if it is necessary for the government to retreat from the lone-assassin myth, we will deal with the second line of defense of the warfare state. That defense will be that rogue elements committed the assassination while operating outside the scope of their governmental authority. This is a line of defense to be explicated when and if the Warren Commission Report loses its value as a means of concealing state guilt in the killing of Kennedy. If this line of defense becomes necessary, then I will be prepared to leave writhing on the barbed wire those shock troops such as Posner who threw away their intellectual integrity on the phony-debate war which raged in defense of the Warren Commission's single-bullet myth.

It Is Highly Speculative at Best that the CIA Agents Around Oswald Were Conspirators in the Killing of Kennedy

(p. 277) Could deMohrenschildt have been a CIA "control" for Oswald, with Moore as the reporting channel?... For his part, deMohrenschildt explicitly denied that Oswald would have been suited for intelligence work. "I never would believe that any government would be stupid enough to trust Lee with anything important," deMohrenschildt testified, "even the government of Ghana would not give him any job of any type." Of course this judgment would be untrustworthy if Moore and deMohrenschildt were pawns in a plot to murder the president, a highly circumstantial and speculative possibility at best.

DeMorhenschildt denied that he was a CIA "control" for Oswald. Further, deMohrenschildt informed us that no government "would have been stupid enough to trust Lee with anything important." You say that a question immediately presents itself to you? Your question is, if Oswald were such a low-level person, of such low intelligence, then why did George deMohrenschildt, an intelligence agent, squire him around Dallas, if not for intelligence reasons?

I choose not to deal with the issue of why deMohrenschildt, a world traveler, who was multi-lingual, socially connected and who had obvious intelligence connections, would have had any reasons other than intelligence considerations to associate so closely with Oswald. You say that it is obvious that deMohrenschildt was Oswald's CIA control. But I instruct you that as the single most sophisticated expert on Oswald that such a conclusion is not obvious to me. Therefore, you as a non-expert cannot so conclude. As an expert I tell you that it is a highly circumstantial and speculative at best to conclude that Moore and deMohrenschildt were pawns in a plot to murder the President. Do you want at best to be highly circumstantial and speculative in your conclusions? Of course you do not.

The CIA Anti-Castro Covert Actions were Directed by the White House Were Not Part of the Institutional Structure

(p.121) Allen Dulles lost no time in orchestrating the new covert Cuban policy within the Special Group. The first discussion at a Special Group meeting about a plan to overthrow Fidel Castro took place on January 13, 1960. This was a landmark meeting, in which CIA Director Allen Dulles laid down a chain of command that excluded the State Department for how the new covert war would be waged. That chain ran directly from the White House to the Special Group... A chain of command running from the president to a committee outside the regular institutions of government was unusual even novel... It was also a power move to exclude the State Department from U.S. Cuban policy in Cuba. That policy was now the "elimination" of Castro and the overthrow of the Cuban government.'

So, now you see that I have carefully described rogue elements within the structure of U.S. government. But the important thing for you to focus upon is that all of this is "outside the regular institutions of government." So, if governmentally employed individuals in this set-up ran amok and killed the President, that unfortunate killing had nothing to do with the question of the merits of our governmental institutions. So, if these rogue elements were involved in killing the President, then this does not speak to the guilt of the U.S. intelligence community. Those rogue elements were, to be sure, bad apples. If such a rogue-element killing happened, and if I should reach the conclusion that I have evidence which supports such a conclusion, I will then advise you that it is responsible to expose those elements. They have probably all passed over the great divide by now. We are all mortal, aren't we?

Exposure of such a conspiracy will prove that we have an open society. The U.S. can then continue its superpower role in our world freed from any imputation of guilt in killing President Kennedy. If you are responsible, and don't jump the gun and make wild charges of institutional U.S. intelligence guilt, we may even ultimately throw into the pot as sharing in the blame a blundering Dulles. Perhaps Robert Kennedy who interloped into CIA operations against Castro–which operations went awry and killed the President–will also have to share some of the blame for the tragic mistakes which contributed to the killing of President Kennedy.

Oswald Had Secret Clearance While in the Marines

(p. 26) Actually, Oswald had access, at a minimum, to secret information while stationed at Atsugi as a consequence of his radar duties there. This much could have been ascertained by no more than a simple phone call to Oswald's former commander at Atsugi, John E. Donovan. "He [Oswald] must have had [a] secret clearance to work in the radar center," Donovan testified to the Warren Commission in 1964, "because that was a minimum requirement for all of us."

Oswald had secret clearance to work at Atsugi. Therefore, his studying of Russian while in the Marines would have had to be with the approval of the Marine Corps. Therefore, some might be driven to the hasty conclusion that Oswald was being trained by the U.S. military for his "defection" to the Soviet Union. But that does not mean that he went to Soviet Russia as a phony defector intelligence agent.

Oswald knew a lot about the CIA's U-2 program. This means he was trusted by U.S. intelligence services even though the government of Ghana would not have trusted him with anything. But this also does not mean he was an intelligent agent. Right?

CIA's Failure to Open a 201 File on Oswald

(p. 47) According to the February 1960 Agency *Clandestine Services Handbook*, 201 files were then opened on persons "of active operational interest at any given point in time..." In addition, the *Handbook* added a fourth category of individual: "It has become apparent that the 201 machine listings should include the identities of persons of operational interest because of their connection with a target group or organization even though there may not be sufficient information or specific interest to warrant opening a file." Oswald fit these criteria, but the fact is that Oswald's CIA 201 file was not opened for over a year after his defection.

Oswald's qualifications required a CIA 201 file, but such a file was not opened for over a year after his defection. I am therefore telling you that no files could have been opened and destroyed, because they demonstrated that Oswald was a fake defector and was really a CIA agent sent to the Soviet Union on assignment. Why is that not probably the case? Because I am the intelligence expert, and I am not going to draw any such conclusion; nor should you.

Oswald's Defection and Abnormalities in his CIA Files

(p. 48) Because no 201 file followed Oswald's defection, it seems reasonable to wonder how the Agency interpreted his defection. Abnormalities in Oswald's files like this one raise questions about his possible role in U.S. intelligence operations.

We can over and over again raise the question of Oswald's possible role in U.S. intelligence. But we never can conclude that Oswald was a U.S. intelligence agent. Because, I am an academic. I require proof before I draw any conclusion from evidence. I deem that the only reliable proof of Oswald's U.S. intelligence connection would be records found in intelligence files demonstrating such a relationship. But we know that if Oswald was a U.S. intelligence agent, the agency to which he was connected would never admit that fact and would never maintain an extant record of that relationship. Therefore, we will never have proof. As a good academic and as an expert in intelligence, it would be a gross error to draw conclusions from evidence of his actions, his income, his movements, his associations with intelligence agents, and his political activities that he was an agent. We must maintain our objectivity and keep looking for the documentary proof of his U.S. agency connection, which proof we know does not exist, and without which we cannot pronounce him as a U.S. intelligence agent. Remember that we must protect against this thought that he was a U.S. intelligence agent becoming conscious.

Yes, I am aware that Professor Philip H. Melanson concluded his book *Spy Saga: Lee Harvey Oswald and U.S. Intelligence* (Praeger, New York, Westport, Connecticut; London, 1990) with the following paragraph:

Finally, if some cabal successfully conspired to subvert the democratic process by disenfranchising citizens' ballots with bullets, this fact must be confronted. Doing so will serve history and democracy well, even if criminal justice cannot now be achieved. We can begin to comprehend a great deal more about the assassination of President John F. Kennedy, about the sources of violence that threaten our political system, and about the nature of covert power and politics when we know the truth about Lee Harvey Oswald: U.S. intelligence agent-provocateur.

But I have been the beneficiary of so much more data in terms of government intelligence documents than was available to Professor Melanson. All of my data, as I have shown, proves that the CIA had an intense and protracted interest in Oswald. Yet, I, who am the expert on which our media rely on for commentary about news releases

about the Kennedy assassination, have not concluded that Lee Harvey Oswald was a U.S. intelligence agent-provocateur. Then, how can Professor Melanson be so speculative in his thinking so as to jump to such an unwarranted conclusion about Oswald and the CIA? No doubt, it is precisely because Professor Melanson is given to such speculative leaps of reasoning that the media are not interested in providing him access. That man risks being called crazy.

The CIA's Breakdown of Security Functions with Respect to Oswald's "Defection"

(p. 50) Thus, unless there is more to the CIA's relationship with Oswald than we are being told, one can argue that the failure of the CIA's mole-hunting experts to open a 201 file in 1959–when they knew that Oswald had defected and offered to give up radar secrets along with "something of special interest"–was a conspicuous breakdown of the Agency's security and counterintelligence functions.

You cannot conclude from the above that the Agency's security and counterintelligence functions were being performed perfectly, and a future assassin was being groomed and being put in place in the Agency's computer bank until needed. You cannot so conclude, because I have not so concluded.

Helms Is Amazed

(pp. 50-51) The following exchange between HSCA questioner Michael Goldsmith and Mr. Helms took place:

MR. GOLDSMITH; Why did it take more than one year to open a 201 file on Oswald? I might add, this is an issue which is somewhat controversial in the case.

MR. HELMS: I can't imagine why it would have taken an entire year. I am amazed. Defect to the USSR (in) October 1959. This [201 opening] in December 1960. There wasn't a 201 file already in existence. I am amazed. Are you sure there wasn't... I can't explain that.

Mr. Goldsmith was extremely curious as to why a 201 file was not opened on Oswald until more than one year after his "defection." Mr. Helms was amazed and could not imagine why a 201 had not been timely opened on Oswald. I do not suggest to the reader that he/she can infer that such a file was in fact opened and was destroyed. Nor do I suggest that there are extant hidden files regarding this "defection." But if Messrs. Goldsmith and Helms and I, Newman, with our expertise, cannot explain this curiosity, then you the reader, a mere subject of the national security state, have no right to try to make sense of this curious malfeasance on the part of the Agency. Should you wish to draw a conclusion from this datum that Oswald was a CIA agent and the CIA's designated JFK-assassination patsy, then I have decided that your conclusions are based on an impossible premise of CIA institutional involvement in shaping Oswald as a patsy in the JFK killing. Your conclusions, as I have previously proclaimed, are crazy.

Priscilla Johnson and her Oswald Interview

(p. 61) ...Priscilla Johnson, the only journalist besides Aline Mosby who succeeded in getting an interview with Lee Harvey Oswald.

Priscilla Johnson got an interview with Oswald in Moscow when he "defected." More below on Priscilla Johnson. But dare you ask whether she was assigned by the CIA to interview Oswald? I am the expert. I do not ask such a question. Why should you?

Priscilla Johnson and the CIA

(p. 61) "Screwball," said a CIA employee who had known Priscilla Johnson at Harvard. "Goofy," and "mixed up," said an April 1958 CIA message characterizing Johnson at the time she had applied for CIA employment in 1952.

(p. 62) CIA interest in Priscilla Johnson was reopened in 1956... On August 23–and in spite of the 1953 security disapproval–a CIA Security Office and FBI records check was completed without adverse comment.

(p. 62) We may surmise that..SR/10 sent a standard form to Chief CI/OA asking for cancellation of the approval for Johnson's operation use.

(p. 63) The 1928 birth date carried in Priscilla Johnson's CIA records for the preceding four years could not be reconciled with this new data unless a fifteen-year-old girl, not yet out of high school, had been working for the Office of Special Operations during World War Two.

(p. 64) Historians now have the unenviable task of trying to figure out whether the CIA was inventing a false Priscilla Johnson or whether it was incapable of telling the difference between two people born five years and three thousand miles apart–not to mention possessing different middle names. The Central Intelligence Agency owes the American public an explanation for the case of two Priscillas, if for no other reason than because a Priscilla Johnson–whom we know to be real–did in fact conduct the longest interview on record with the accused assassin of President Kennedy.

The above material proves that the CIA had a very intense interest in Priscilla Johnson dating from her application for employment with the Agency in 1952. The CIA records seem to indicate the existence of two Priscilla Johnsons. The Central Intelligence Agency owes the American public an explanation for the case of two Priscillas.

But you as a member of that public cannot conclude that Priscilla Johnson was a CIA agent. Why cannot you so conclude? Well, if you were to conclude that Priscilla Johnson was a CIA agent when she interviewed Oswald in Moscow, then this would raise the issue of whether Oswald's "defection" was really a "defection" or was a fake defection to place Oswald in the Soviet Union on assignment for the CIA. If Priscilla Johnson was a CIA agent, then her interview would appear to be a device through which the Agency sought to receive a progress report on how Oswald was doing in his assignment to spy on the Soviets. If Oswald was a phony defector, and was in his Soviet sojourn under the control of the CIA, then this would lend weight to the belief that Oswald was in the control of the same Agency in Dealey Plaza. This would support Oswald's contention on the night of the assassination that he was a patsy. But, we have proclaimed that a high-level involvement of the CIA in the killing of Kennedy is not a rational concept. If you choose to believe from the above evidence that Priscilla Johnson was a CIA agent, then you are well on the way to declaring yourself irrational. You don't want to do that, do you?

CIA's Anti-Castro Operations

(p. 91) The Warren Commission's 1964 investigation into the Kennedy assassination failed to consider the CIA's anti-Castro operations in any capacity at all... There could be no more profound omission to any study of Oswald's activities in the months before the murder of Kennedy than that of the CIA's anti-Cuban operations.

The Warren Commission's failure to consider the CIA's anti-Castro operations is a most profound omission. We have set forth above that the White House was directly responsible for the anti-Castro team. Robert Kennedy was responsible for the CIA's anti-

Cuban operations. It may well turn out after future critical research that Robert Kennedy's anti-Castro team got out of control and killed his brother. That might explain why the Warren Commission, out of respect for the Kennedy family, decided to overlook this ugly aspect of Robert Kennedy's role in the unfortunate and unwitting killing of his brother. It may turn out that the Warren commission proved to be a compassionate and responsible body by covering the sins of Robert Kennedy by arriving at conclusions which constituted Epsteinian political truth. Right?

Richard M. Bissell

(p. 116) Richard M. Bissell agreed with King's recommendation to consider assassinating Castro. Bissell was a powerful man in the CIA's covert world: He was in charge of all the Agency's clandestine services, then called the "Directorate of Plans."

Over the years, we have gradually learned of Bissell's role in the CIA's original planning to assassinate Castro. First, there is the CIA's own Inspector General's Report, written in 1967 after a Jack Anderson broadcast leaking details of CIA's links to the Mafia and assassination plots.

So, the CIA employed the Mafia in these anti-Castro plans. As you well know, sometimes the Mafia seems because of its clumsiness involved not in organized but rather disorganized crime. The Mafia is a dirty-dealing-double-crossing outfit that tends to get out of hand. It was clearly a mistake, a big mistake, for the CIA to have employed these duplicitous Italian gangsters in the anti-Castro operations. It may well turn out that the Mafia, because of its connections with Jimmie Hoffa and because of Hoffa's hatred of Robert Kennedy, turned around from its assignment to kill Castro and killed the President.

If this blowback assassination is what happened, then the CIA should not be protected from criticism for having made a very serious mistake in employing those Italian gangsters. If this proves to be the case, the CIA should be forbidden in the future from employing the Mafia for any purpose. Out of respect for Robert Kennedy and the Kennedy family we should probably underplay somewhat Robert Kennedy's role in heading up this operation. Don't you feel that this disclosure of the CIA's mistake, and the reason for the Warren Commission's overlooking the anti-Castro evidence out of excessive concern for the Kennedy family's feelings, would go far towards renewing our faith in our open society? Of course, I anticipated your assent. This would strip the assassination of Cold War aspects and make irrelevant all the historical material recently released by our State Department to which I will made further reference below. Those documents show that President Kennedy was, in his efforts to mollify the Cold War, involved in a lonely and unequal struggle against a national security state apparatus which opposed and hated him.

Living with Castro

(p. 119) The Vice President [Nixon] recalled that some State Department officials had earlier taken the position that we would be able to live with Castro.

Here we see this fixation on disposing of Castro was a Kennedy family problem. But for the Kennedy family, all that fuss over Cuba might have been avoided. It now turns out that we have proof that President Kennedy opposed the bombing and invasion of Cuba in the Bay of Pigs and Cuban Missile Crisis. He opposed crushing Cuba when the Joint Chiefs, the CIA, and all of the Congress were for it. It now turns out that President Kennedy at the time of his assassination was seeking to normalize relations

with Cuba. But the U.S. media refuses to reveal the proof of these Kennedy peace-making efforts to our citizens. That proof is found in documents issued by the Department of State in its "Foreign Relations of the United States, 1961-1963, Volume XI, Cuban Missile Crisis and Aftermath" U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington provided as proof. So, don't expect me to focus on the proof. Now that we have this rich new historical source, I as an historian will not change a word of what I said in my book. Rather I choose to accept Jack Anderson and his Mafia story as my source for historical truth. For after all, the rogue element scenario is rational. The thesis of a national security state Cold War killing of President Kennedy is totally irrational.

Covert Side of the CIA–Semi-Autonomous Operation

(p. 128) "This was a radical departure from standard Agency procedure," Hunt observed, "but the system had been foreshadowed by the semi-autonomous status of our Guatemalan operation." The entire covert side of the CIA was becoming a semi-autonomous operation.

So, if it turns out that elements of the CIA had a role in the assassination, we will be able to designate that role as outside of its systemic organizational structure. At some future date we may decide to concede the immaculate invalidity of the well-intentioned and responsible Warren Commission and its Report. If we decide to admit to the fallibility of the single-assassin scenario, then we will be able to characterize those bad apples who killed Kennedy in a blowback intelligence situation as semi-autonomous to the CIA's charter functions and therefore rogue elements. Right?

The FBI and Oswald Documents

(p. 153) When the FBI sent a list of Oswald documents–purporting to be its entire pre-assassination holdings–to the Warren Commission, the February 26, 1960, memo was missing. So was the entire story of what was in the FBI's 1960 Dallas field office files on Oswald.

The FBI failed to divulge all of its files on Oswald to the Warren Commission. This indicates that Oswald may have had FBI agency connections which the FBI was too embarrassed to reveal. But, the CIA had similar problems with its Oswald files, and yet we could not arrive at the conclusion that Oswald was a CIA agent. So, quod erat demonstrandum, we cannot arrive at the conclusion that Oswald was an FBI agent. Solid reasoning is so easy among people of good will when we are freed from the irritation of the fruitcakes who are always jumping to conspiratorial judgments for which there is no rational basis.

Church Committee, Castro and Cuba

(p. 202) The Church Committee report states how the idea of using the mob to kill Castro grew from Edwards' idea of "contacting members of a gambling syndicate operating in Cuba."

We cannot reiterate enough the connection of the mob's efforts to kill Castro and the Kennedy assassination. You see, if we embrace this idea, then all we have to do to accomplish our purpose of restoring faith in our governmental institutions is to point out that the killing of Kennedy was an unfortunate mistake of the CIA and Robert Kennedy who were victimized by the Mafia. Is this not the work of fine citizens in a society which we are seeking through our work to make more open?

More on deMohrenschildt and the CIA

(p. 278) Did deMohrenschildt have other contacts with the CIA? …"Yes, I talked with deMohrenschildt," [CIA case officer Mike] Anikeeff concedes, "and may have spoken with him about Oswald." However, Anikeeff is adamant he "never had said anything to the Agency" about these discussions.

CIA case officer Mike Anikeeff spoke to Oswald and deMohrenschildt. But he adamantly denied speaking to the CIA about Oswald. As I have told you, I have friends who are CIA agents. I believe CIA officers when they speak. Why shouldn't you? This does not mean that Oswald or deMohrenschildt worked for the Agency or that deMohrenschildt was reporting to Anikeeff about Oswald's activities. This is one of "the already large and growing pile of interesting coincidences in this case" (p. 279). I am really very proud to acknowledge constructive help in writing this book from case officer Mike Anikeeff.

deMohrenschildt and the Soviet Russia CIA Division

(p. 279) That deMohrenschildt had a close contact in the Soviet Russia Division of 1962-1953 is newsworthy. It does not, however, prove that Oswald or deMohrenschildt worked for the Agency or that deMohrenschildt was reporting to Anikeeff about Oswald's activities. For the time being, we will add this to the already large and growing pile of interesting coincidences in this case.

Proof of Agency employment of Oswald and deMohrenschildt will await a paper trail which will prove or disprove that. The Agency of course would never destroy or conceal such a paper trail. For the time being, we will add this to the already large and growing pile of interesting coincidences in this case. You will recall, I am sure, that the Warren Commission ascribed to "happenstance" a curious situation regarding deMohrenschildt being in Guatemala on a walking tour while the Bay of Pigs invaders were being trained to attack Cuba. Similarly, we choose to ascribe these many curiosities to "coincidences." If there is a choice between being an irresponsible nut or joining a responsible historian in believing in a mountain of coincidences, probability theory notwithstanding, you know where you will come down on that no-brainer decision. Correct?

Unfortunately, the CIA has Made Misleading Statements about Oswald

(p. 284) ...it was a distinction to be put on the CIA's illegal mail intercept program once, let alone twice, like Oswald had been. But then, Oswald's mail was opened even after he was taken off the list.

Just as anomalous was having mail opened before one is even on the list. This is what happened to Marina.

...Unfortunately, over the years the CIA has made misleading statements about the Oswald letters they opened.

From the above admittedly extraordinary and illegal mail intercept program which the CIA put into place with Oswald, it would be wrong to conclude that the CIA was keeping careful track of their agent who was to have a starring role as their patsy lone assassin of President Kennedy. You are wrong to see in this elaborate intercept program the eye of our Big Brother observing every move of this star future patsy. I use the word "unfortunately" to characterize the CIA's "misleading statements" about this intercept program. Please do not be strident and substitute for "unfortunately" the words "deliberately," "premeditatedly," and "ominously." Don't be frenzied and substitute for

the studied term "misleading statements" the words "lies," "prevarications," or "falsehoods." We are involved in polite and academic discourse. Right?

The CIA was Spinning a False Yarn About Oswald Before the Assassination

(p. 392) Within the labyrinth of Oswald's intelligence files at CIA headquarters is a set of papers which, together, demonstrate that the Agency had a keen operational interest in Oswald's activities during the eight weeks before the murder of President Kennedy... The Agency has long claimed, falsely, that it did not know of his visits there (Mexico City Cuban Consulate) until after the assassination. As we will see, this story was concocted as a cover to protect the Agency's sources in Mexico City. In addition, newly released documents prove that the CIA was spinning a false yarn about Oswald before the assassination.

I employ the term "operational interest" to describe the CIA's surveillance of Oswald during the eight weeks before the assassination. You are not to conclude that the interest was in the nature of the CIA directing its employee-patsy to visit the Cuban Consulate and thereby leave a trail of the Kennedy "assassin" which would appear to implicate Cuba in the assassination. You cannot conclude that the purpose of this Mexico City excursion of Oswald was designed to provide our national security state with some leverage against Fidel Castro and to offer our warfare state the possible option of invading Cuba. For you to jump to such conclusions demonstrates that you are unable to think in an organized fashion.

U.S. Intelligence Agencies were Most Interested in Oswald

(p. 421) It is safe to state now, however, that American intelligence agencies were far more interested in Oswald than the public has been led to believe.

So, the American intelligence agencies lied to the public about the intensity of their interest in Oswald. But, you cannot conclude from this that this great interest in Oswald by U.S. intelligence agencies would include an interest in slipping him a few bucks and making him an employee who could be observed legally. We cannot conclude from any of this material that Oswald was an employee of U.S. intelligence, because if we do, then under the concept of respondeat superior, the principals can be deemed legally liable for the crimes of their agents. And since we know that U.S. intelligence involvement in the assassination at some high level is crazy, you do not want to be marginalized and viewed as crazy. Do you?

CIA Use of Oswald's "Defection"

(p. 422) There is limited evidence that suggests that an Agency counterintelligence operation made use of Oswald's defection.

If Oswald went to the Soviet Union not as a defector but as a CIA infiltrator, and Oswald was used as a patsy in the killing of Kennedy, we would expect the CIA to maintain a careful paper trail to reveal that he was our man in Minsk. Right?

CIA Agents Swarmed Around Oswald in New Orleans as Bees Swarm Around Honey

(p. 427) A surprising number [of] the characters in Oswald's New Orleans episode turned out to be informants or contract agents of the CIA. The FBI jailhouse interview with Oswald, which focused on the FPCC, was suppressed until after Oswald returned from Mexico.

Now, you cannot judge Oswald by the company he kept in New Orleans. In little Old New Orleans birds of a feather did not flock together. The people around Oswald in

New Orleans were CIA agents. He reported to the FBI while incarcerated for his activities as the only Fair Play for Cuba member of his group of one. From all of this, if you conclude that Oswald was a double agent for the CIA and the FBI, you are jumping to an illogical conclusion. Right?

Oswald's Mexico City Escapades Had Nothing to Do with Setting Up Castro

(pp. 427-428) What about the Cuban Consulate cover story? Why was it considered so sensitive if the CIA knew, before November 22, that Oswald had visited the consulate in Mexico City? We noted Helms' explanation that it was to cover the Agency's sources there. Was it erected to cover something more troubling that the CIA knew about Oswald?... there have long been rumors in the media that during his Cuban Consulate visit Oswald had threatened to kill Kennedy. FBI director Hoover informed the Warren Commission that Castro told this privately to the Bureau's "Solo" source, but this was withheld from the public... Hoover's replacement as FBI director, Clarence Kelley, believed that Oswald made such a threat.

So, the CIA knew that Oswald had gone to the Cuban Consulate in Mexico City and threatened to kill Kennedy. Please do not conclude from this that our CIA, which had bitterly opposed Kennedy's refusal to back up the Bay of Pigs invasion with U.S. forces, and which joined with the Joint Chiefs of Staff in proposing the bombing and invasion of Cuba during the Cuban Missile Crisis, was trying to set up Castro for the killing of Kennedy. I know that there has been a flood of historical documents recently which support the idea that President Kennedy was alone in his opposition to a Cuban invasion during the Cuban Missile Crisis. But please, let us not provide Cold War historical documents which provide a motive for the national security state to kill President Kennedy. We have already decided that such a thesis is crazy. Right?

(p. 430) WHAT DOES THIS DO FOR THE CASE?

The CIA was far more interested in Oswald than they have ever admitted to publicly. At some time before the Kennedy assassination, the Cuban affairs offices of the CIA developed a keen operational interest in him. Oswald's visit to Mexico City may have had some connection to the CIA or FBI. It appears that the Mexico City station wrapped its own operation around Oswald's consular visits there. Whether or not Oswald understood what was going on is less clear than the probability that something operational was happening in conjunction with his visit.

The CIA developed a keen operational interest in Oswald. "Oswald's visit to Mexico City may have had some connection to the CIA or FBI." You say that the word "may" is too tenuous, because I have said that: "It appears that the Mexico City station wrapped its own operation around Oswald's consular visits there." If the Mexico City CIA station had wrapped its own operation around Oswald's consular visit, then you tell me that perforce, Oswald's visit to Mexico City was definitely connected with the CIA and perhaps also with the FBI.

You say that something operational could not have been going on without Oswald having known that he was part of it. You say that no CIA operation could have been put into place which would have depended on Oswald serendipitously showing up at the Cuban Mexico City Embassy. You say that Oswald would have had to have been a witting agent of the CIA operation. You say that you have just demonstrated that Oswald was a CIA agent on assignment in Mexico. If you so conclude you are guilty of the same

kind of irresponsible stretch of speculative reasoning in which Professor Philip H. Melanson indulged. You don't want to be irresponsibly speculative.

The Renegade Faction Hypothesis and this Reviewer's Counter

(p. 430) While we are unclear on the precise reasons for the CIA's pre-assassination withholding of information on Oswald, we have yet to find documentary evidence for an institutional plot in the CIA to murder the president. The facts do not compel such a conclusion. If there had been such a plot, many of the documents we are reading–such as the CIA cables to Mexico City, the FBI, State, and Navy–would never had been created. However, the facts may well fit into other scenarios, such as the "renegade faction" hypothesis. Oswald appears–from the perspective of a potential conspirator with access–to have been a tempting target for involvement because of the sensitivity of his files.

...On the other hand, we can finally say with some authority that the CIA was spawning a web of deception about Oswald weeks before the president's murder, a fact that may have directly contributed to the outcome in Dallas. Is it possible that when Oswald turned up with a rifle on the president's motorcade route, the CIA found itself living in an unthinkable nightmare of its own making?

This Reviewer Feels Constrained to Address Professor Newman

At this juncture, this reviewer chooses to drop the first person singular address as applied to Professor Newman's presumed thoughts. I now speak to Professor Newman in my voice. This reviewer, Professor Newman, is convinced that the renegade faction hypothesis, which you appear to be so willing to embrace, is in fact irrational. Irrespective of your designation of the view, this reviewer is convinced that the thesis of an institutional plot in the CIA to murder the President is the only rational explanation for the data which you discuss in your book. The explanations that there was a high-level plot to kill President Kennedy had long been declared by Professor Noam Chomsky to be irrational. On November 21, 1998, this reviewer delivered a two-hour speech in Dallas espousing the thesis of a high-level national security state plot to kill President Kennedy, and that any concept of a renegade conspiratorial killing was irrational. On November 23, 1998, this reviewer sent a copy of that speech to Professor Chomsky with the following request: "I have that kind of perverse nature that only benefits from negative criticism. Could you find time to provide some?

On February 16, 1999, Professor Chomsky replied: "It's (the speech) is a lucid presentation of the conclusions that you and others have reached." 'Lucid" in dictionaries is defined as rational. Therefore, Professor Chomsky no longer shares your view that a high-level institutional conspiracy explanation of the assassination is irrational.

This reviewer, Professor Newman, wishes to excerpt one concept from that speech which compels the conclusion of a high-level national security conspiracy to kill President Kennedy. You will no doubt recall the 18 1/2-minute gap in the Watergate tapes which served to prove the institutional guilt of and brought down President Richard N. Nixon and his cohorts. This reviewer will demonstrate how the U.S. national security state destroyed not 18 ½ minutes of tape, but about 5 ½ hours of three tapes which proved their guilt in the killing of President Kennedy.

In November of 1966, this reviewer read Theodore H. White's *The Making of the President, 1964*. On page 20 of the book I came across the following:

There is a tape recording in the archives of the government which best recaptures the sound of the hours as it waited for leadership. It is a recording of all the conversations in the air, monitored by the Signal Corps Midwestern center "Liberty," between Air Force One in Dallas, the Cabinet plane over the Pacific, and the Joint Chiefs' Communications Center in Washington.

Then on page 48 this reviewer read the following about the flight back to Washington, D.C. from Dallas:

On the flight the party learned that there was no conspiracy, learned of the identity of Oswald and his arrest; and the President's mind turned to the duties of consoling the stricken and guiding the quick.

Now, this reviewer knew that on November 23, 1963, the *Dallas Morning News* had informed its readers that the Dallas District Attorney, Henry Wade, stated:

Preliminary reports indicated more than one person was involved in the shooting...the electric chair is too good for the killers.

Despite the evidence of conspiracy of which Dealey Plaza wreaked, the White House Situation Room had informed President Johnson and the other occupants of Air Force One, that notwithstanding what they may have smelled, seen and felt in Dealey Plaza which spoke of a conspiratorial crossfire, that Oswald was to be designated as the lone assassin.

This reviewer wrote to Mr. White. Mr. White replied, informing him by letter that the communications to Air Force One and the Cabinet Plane were:

By government radio–all relays go through a big Signal Corps center in the Midwest–and the White House was in constant communications with the plane.

This reviewer then wrote to Dr. Robert Bahmer, Archivist of the United States, requesting access to the tape. Dr. Bahmer replied:

We have no knowledge of the existence or location of the tape recording mentioned by Mr. White, despite having made some efforts since the receipt of your letter to obtain some information about it.

This reviewer then noted that Pierre Salinger in his book, *With Kennedy* reported that the party on the Cabinet plane heard:

The message kept coming off the wire service machine and finally one started grinding out the story of Lee Harvey Oswald and his previous life, in Russia...

So, this reviewer wrote to Pierre Salinger on December 3, 1966:

In your fine work, *With Kennedy*, you make mention of radio communications with the White House and the Cabinet plane over the Pacific on November 22, 1963 (pp. 212-25) You identify "Stranger" as Major Harold R. Patterson.

Theodore H. White, *The Making of the President, 1964*, also refers to these conversations but particularly related to those dialogues with the presidential plane, Air Force One.

I have asked the National Archives for a copy of this tape. Dr. Bahmer, the excellent Archivist of the United States, cannot locate it, although Mr. White states on page 21 of his book: "There is a tape recording in the archives of the government." I enclose Dr. Bahmer's letter, Mr. White will not provide any further information.

Specifically what I am about is the verification of what Mr. White states was on the tape, to wit: "On the flight the party learned that there was no conspiracy; learned of the identity of Oswald and his arrest; and the President's mind turned to the duties of

consoling the stricken and guiding the quick." If such was said, before there was any evidence against Lee Harvey Oswald as the assassin, and while there was overwhelming evidence of a conspiracy, then the White House is in the interesting position of being the first to designate Oswald as the assassin and the first to have ruled out, in the face of impressive evidence to the contrary, the notion there could have been a conspiracy.

Now, Mr. Salinger...That tape is being denied only to the American public...Will you render this service to civilian rule and democracy for which President Kennedy gave his life?

Respectfully yours,

Vincent J. Salandria

Mr. Salinger replied on December 26. He was most willing to serve civilian rule and democracy:

The section of my book dealing with the conversations between the White House and the Cabinet plane were taken from a transcript of the tape of those conversations made by the White House Communication Agency. I have never either read or heard the tape to which Mr. White refers, i.e. the conversations with Air Force One. Since the tape with which I worked was provided by the White House Communication Agency, it would seem to me that the tape of the conversation to which you refer would emanate from the same source, if such a tape, in fact, exists.

As to the conversation with the Cabinet plane, the transcript of that conversation is in my personal files which have been turned over to the National Archives for placement in the Kennedy Library.

I certainly have no objection to your seeing that transcript, although the National Archives will undoubtedly write and ask my permission since it is included in my personal papers.

Sincerely yours,

Pierre Salinger"

This reviewer then wrote to Dr. Bahmer who replied:

After receipt of your letter of December 28, a careful examination was made of the papers that Mr. Salinger has sent to us for storage. We have not, however, been able to find anything in the nature of a transcript of the tape recording that you are searching for.

This reviewer then wrote directly to the White House Communication Agency requesting access to the tape recording: James U. Cross, Armed Forces Aide to the President, replied:

I have been asked to respond to your letter, addressed to the White House Communication Agency, concerning a tape recording to Air Force One, November 22,1963.

Logs and tapes of the radio transmissions of military aircraft, including those of Air Force One, are kept for official use only. These tapes are not releasable, nor are they obtainable from commercial sources.

I am sorry my response cannot be more favorable.

Of course, Cross lied. They were obtainable by Theodore H. White and Pierre Salinger for non-official use.

The contents of this message to Air Force One was confirmed in 1993 by Robert Manning, Kennedy's Assistant Secretary of State for Public Affairs, who on November

22, 1963 was on the presidential plane on its return trip from Love to Andrews Air Force. He reported having heard the same account of Oswald being designated as the presumed assassin. (Gerald S. and Deborah H. Strober, *Let Us Begin Anew, An Oral History of the Kennedy Presidency*, Harper Collins Publisher, 1993).

Mr. Douglas P. Horne, a staff member of the Assassination Records Review Board, spoke at the Lancer conference in Dallas in November, 1999. He spoke at length of the Review Board's fruitless attempts to locate the audio taped communications to Air Force One. He informed the audience that it was a shame that the 6 or 7 hours of three separate tapes appear to be gone from this world. 18 ½-minutes of missing tapes was a fatal matter which caused the Nixon Presidency to unravel. A 90-minute edited tape is extant. The disappearance of some 5 1/2 hours of this vital tape which was made to disappear by the U.S. military leaves our national security state, the force behind the assassination of a peace-seeking President John F. Kennedy, undisturbed and still the preeminent power extending U.S. military hegemony throughout the globe.

We know from the three sources which we have supplied what is contained on that tape and what that tape proves with respect to the institutional involvement of our national security state in the killing of President Kennedy .

Professor Newman, I respectfully invite you to debate with me the issue of whether Oswald was a U.S. intelligence agent and whether the killing of Kennedy was the work of the national security state at its very highest level? I put to you the thought that no free and open society, thirty-six years after the killing of our head of state can deny airing such a debate. I submit to you that such a debate will serve to reaffirm and expand free speech and democracy in our nation.

MM (2/2/2000)

Vince, I must say that I agree with Marty that the Newman piece is not as effective as it could be. What I was trying to show you with the fake reply from Newman was how easy it will be for him to reply, and how little he will have to say. I doubt that he will reply at all, though. Why should he reply to you when he didn't reply to me in 1994? My challenge to him was much the same as yours.

The narrative voice is confusing: Who is "I"?

I don't think it is necessary to quote nearly so much. That does drag it out.

I would suggest a direct approach. For example, Newman thanks his friends in the CIA, etc. Just what it is that you reproach him for here? What is the charge? Be explicit. Give it to him right in his face. You're not going to get a response, so get in your licks and make them hurt, because that's the only satisfaction you'll get. Your message will be conveyed to other readers more effectively, too. Don't confuse them by making them wonder who "I" is supposed to be.

By the way, here would be the point to investigate Michael Parenti's remark to me in 1994 that Newman had made serious enemies in the CIA. I asked Parenti how he knew this. He didn't reply. Where are these supposed enemies of this supposed renegade whistle-blower? Does anybody know of any? What damage is he supposed to have done to the CIA?

It might be better to take the opposite approach–the velvet gloves instead of the boxing gloves–and make all your points in the form of puzzled questions. Why, given X, does he conclude Y? Is it logical? Make analogies. But make it clear you want an answer.

That's what we want, isn't it–to get him talking to us? How will we ever know anything more about him than we do right now if he doesn't talk to us?

Maybe John, Gary, or Joe can think of a way to create such a dialogue. Newman will certainly never talk with us if he thinks we all think he's an agent–which we don't, so all we need to do is be honest about it. "Help me assuage the doubts of this skeptic Salandria (et al.)," and so on.

MM (2/3/2000)

CAQ published an article some time ago purporting to debunk the theories of artificial AIDS origin which was very poorly done. They, like Z magazine and ZNet, are very much in the Chomsky camp, which means anti-conspiracy–regardless of the evidence. As you may have read on my site, one of the publishers of CAQ, Bill Schaap (who also testified at the Jowers trial) told me that AIDS was less important than the JFK assassination (which is grossly incorrect, comparing the numbers of deaths involved), and that the Duesberg theory (that HIV doesn't cause AIDS) was the most "promising" of the dissident theories. CAQ has always studiously avoided the topic of assassinations, and I have a letter from one of the editors (Bill Vornberger), who is no longer with them, saying that "we" believe JFK was killed by "rogue CIA agents."

This is all the more puzzling when you know that Schaap and Ellen Ray of CAQ were the publishers of *Lies of Our Times* (now defunct), which was one of the few journals to give Oliver Stone's *JFK* a fair shake, and as far as I know they still run Sheridan Square Press, which published Jim Garrison's book. They were nastily attacked for defending the Stone film by Alexander Cockburn of *The Nation* (whose consistent perfidy you can read about in Marty's book), and since then have apparently kept mum.

Chomsky, I think, is at the center of this. He wrote regularly for *Lies of Our Times*, and his picture adorns advertisements for CAQ. He is the one who put me onto CAQ (then CAIB). It would be very interesting to have some candid conversation with Ray and Schaap, to find out why they dropped "conspiracy theory" like a hot potato and what it has to do with Chomsky (which I suspect is a lot).

Tom Keske asks what results we expect from the JFK case. This is a good question. You will find, if you read Vince and Marty, with whom I agree, that we think it is the very notion of a continuing "mystery" that is the main ingredient of the cover-up. There is no mystery. We know who did it and why (cf. Vince's COPA speech).

The Jowers trial proved that MLK was killed as the result of a conspiracy in which the US government was involved. If the government was involved, the government was automatically, perforce, the main conspirator, and it was a government conspiracy. That is now on the record and a matter of history. Now look around at the coverage that trial has gotten, and the (lack of) impact it has had.

These conspiracies to murder JFK, MLK, RFK, etc. have been proven many times over. This is what Vince's current work on Newman is all about. Newman gives us the evidence to prove Oswald was a CIA agent, and then tells us that we cannot conclude this. This is also what the Warren Commission did, as Vince also showed in his 1977 article "The Design of the Warren Report, to Fall to Pieces."

I agree the origin of AIDS is the most important issue now, certainly in terms of the number of people suffering and dying, and as a foretaste of further biowar to come. That is why I want you in this group, Tom. JFK is only part of a much bigger conspiracy. Vince and Marty see this, too, I think, and to some extent the others (and some are still

making up their minds, I guess). We need to ally ourselves with other groups–gays, blacks, Indians, prisoners, whatever, also outside the US–to come to grips with the enemy. We have some in our group who do not believe there is such an enemy–that for example Hoover, Johnson, Allen Dulles and a few other "renegades" were behind the JFK assassination but that all our institutions, including the CIA, are still basically innocent and well-intentioned. We need to challenge them, too, in fact especially them, if we hope to make any headway with the population at large.

As Vince and Marty and I agree (I'm purposely leaving anybody out whose opinions I'm not sure about), the price that virtually all our potential allies pay, as soon as they get a taste of power and access to the media, is to accept the basic lie that the government is still (if it ever was) legitimate and democratic. It is not. Even Ramsey Clark, who still doesn't believe there was a conspiracy to kill JFK, says the country is a "plutocracy." You cannot have a plutocracy and a democracy at the same time. You have to choose. If you choose respectability and access, you choose plutocracy. You are willing to be a tiny voice of protest in the mainstream, but you go right on flowing gently and merrily down that stream.

There flow they all: Chomsky, Michael Parenti, CAQ, COPA, Newman, etc.

VS (2/3/2000)

I quite agree with Marty that my piece on Newman is not readable. I do not agree that it has no value to provoke thought.

No one in our group has analyzed my review and focused on each of the many precise excerpts from Newman, and exculpated Newman from my overall charges. I charge that he has offered enormous mounds of evidence that prove Oswald was a CIA operative and that the CIA as an institution was in control of him from when he went to the Soviet Union as a "defector" to his designation by the Agency as the JFK patsy. I charge that the Agency who controlled Oswald had to be the agency that designated him as the patsy. I conclude this because no agency in the world other than the CIA would have dared to have used a CIA operative as a patsy. I conclude this because as L. Fletcher Prouty, Col. U.S.A.F. (Ret.) said in the very subtitle of *The Secret Team: The CIA and its Allies in Control of the United States and the World*. I suggest that it is far, far more likely that the CIA manipulated Oswald and any elements involved in the assassination than that rogue elements could have successfully manipulated Oswald and the CIA and then have had the U.S. Establishment cover for it.

I continue to believe that Professor Newman's first task is to dump tons of data on us which would leave any non-mind-numbed and non-chauvinist person to conclude that the CIA killed Kennedy. His next task, which he has performed, is to instruct the world that such a conclusion is "crazy."

MM (2/6/2000)

Further analysis, following Marty's excellent lead, of John Thomas's thinking:

Original John (Feb. 4):

The structure and mission of the CIA is such that it empowers insiders who want to use the agency secretly for their own purposes. Further, the political leanings of the type of person likely to be recruited by, and inclined to accept a position with, the agency is decidedly right wing, so there is a lot of fascist thinking inside which, given the agency's nautilus-like structure, is able to act on its own initiative unchecked, undetected,

funded by budgets from their own sector (as well as by front operation revenues) and with access to enormous resources throughout the government.

In the kind of coup that happened in the JFK assassination, the leader is simply killed, and the next in formal succession takes formal power. Of course the successor does so with the knowledge–either overt or implied–that the killers are still around and that defiance of them may mean doom. In the case of the JFK assassination, democracy was not destroyed. It was dealt a blow. We have a reasonable semblance of democracy today. But it is chastened–in evil fashion–by the implied threat of termination with extreme prejudice of the lives or careers of any who step too far out of line with the fascist forces at work in the clandestine inner recesses of the defense/intelligence establishment.

Your point that the broader, official CIA can then be made the goat is also cogent....

Now, the only course I got a D in in college was logic. Nevertheless, quixotically, I still find myself trying to be logical.

Am I wrong, or does John's argument distill to the following syllogism:

1. If A then X.
2. If X then B.
3. Therefore: If A then B.

This is tantamount to:

1. X is necessary for A.
2. X empowers B.
3. Therefore, B is necessary for A.

X = Intelligence agencies

A = Democracy, "the maintenance of liberty"

B = Fascism, involving "insiders who want to use the agency secretly for their own purposes," "fascist forces at work in the clandestine inner recesses of the defense/intelligence establishment," "fascist thinking which, given [X's] nautilus-like structure, is able to act on its own initiative unchecked, undetected, funded by budgets from their own sector, as well as by front operation revenues, and with access to enormous resources throughout the government," "threats to kill" or ruin "any who step too far out of line with [B])," the murder of the titular head of state and his successor's "knowledge that the killers are still around and that defiance of them may mean doom."

Comments welcome.

MM (2/7/2000)

To comment on my own post, I see I omitted documentation of Premise 1, which was stupid of me because it is the crux:

Original John: "...intelligence agencies being as necessary as they are to the maintenance of liberty" (Feb. 4).

Hence Premise 1: X (intelligence agencies) are necessary for A (Democracy, liberty).

Or: If A then X .

Premise 2: X empowers B (Fascism, the Secret Team).

Or: If X then B.

Conclusion: If A then B. (If we want Democracy, we must accept Fascism.)

The logic is ok. If Premise 1 is true, and Premise 2 is true, then the Conclusion is true.

The problem is with Premise 1. It is not true. We do not need intelligence agencies to maintain liberty. That is the crux of our differences.

John wants to fight the ST. That means fighting Premise 2. Difficult, since he accepts it as true (and so do I). Perhaps he wants to render it untrue. How does he want to do that? I am curious.

I on the other hand dispute Premise 1. Perhaps John can convince me that it is true. Perhaps he can come up with an example (even one!) of how the CIA works to "maintain liberty."

In the meantime–for I think this will take a while–I think we're getting somewhere. I have been inclined toward Fletch's ST theory in the past, but seeing how it works in John's logic puts it in a different light.

VS (2/7/2000)

John, you choose no longer to communicate with me. But I continue to endeavor to communicate with you and with love.

I never called you treasonous, nor have I ever called you a murderer. My opinion is that your approach to the assassination unwittingly helps to protect the murderous U.S. national security state institutions which I am convinced killed JFK for what they viewed as his treasonous dealings with the Soviets, Cuba and Vietnam. But, I do not blame you for holding your view. Rather, I feel that you view is interesting and deserved to and deserves to be addressed.

You have accused me of seeking "the overthrow of the US government, or–more correctly–the absolute destruction of America as a global power." You say I am:

perfectly content to leave in place the Secret Team and other clandestine operations that pollute our intelligence communities, frustrate our democracy and threaten our liberty. ...we do not know whether this is genuine, or a device by which, in channeling our discussion towards the improbably bizarre, they can keep truth seeking from realistic investigation. In CIA baby-sitter parlance, this is known as "keeping them on the reservation."

John, you know that I don't wish for the overthrow of the U.S. government, nor the absolute destruction of America as a global power. But, I am opposed to any super power which relies on covert action and military might to establish and to maintain world hegemony. However, my opposition, as you well know, is always non-violent in nature. I am opposed to all covert action which I feel as a consequence of its covertness is antithetical to democracy. Democracy I view as requiring an informed citizenry. I am against secret teams, and desperately want them exposed and punished for their crimes. On this issue, you and I are as one. With respect to my being in the lap of the CIA, John, you don't mean that. I opine that this is your anger and not your reason speaking here.

But it is true that I am opposed to any system which permits organizations which by structure and mission give birth to powerful secret teams. These secret structures are so powerful that heads of state, here and elsewhere, may be removed by assassination. They are so powerful that and our government, media and academia all combine to pretend that the brutal work of these teams is the work of single assassins, or of the Mafia, or of rogue elements. I am opposed to the process of marginalizing those who

would speak the truth and seek to point out a natural and probable knowing connection between the work of secret teams and the organizations which give birth to them.

I feel that the mothering agencies must be stripped of their structure and mission which authorize murderous substructures that criminally overthrow democratically elected foreign and domestic heads of state. Because, I believe that unless they are held institutionally responsible and accountable for the crimes which they fathered, those crimes will be repeated and expanded. True freedom, I feel, cannot long survive such institutional perversion of constitutional democracy.

Now, John, I don't know how you can know that only rogue elements were involved in the assassination. I don't know how you know that it is a crazy concept to imagine that their putative agencies are perforce not innocent of any involvement. My view is, as you know, contrary to yours. I never purported to you or to anyone else that my view was otherwise. When you met me, I stated my view forthrightly.

Read my work in *False Mystery*. There is in my work if nothing else the consistent concept that the Warren Report was a patent fraud, and that the killing of JFK was a high-level-national security state-Cold War killing. When you met me, you heard me out as I expressed that same opinion, and then you praised me for having had a positive influence on your thinking. Not a word of negative criticism was uttered by you about my views until after my 1998 Dallas speech. As I clerked for our committee of correspondence for several years, I never expressed contrary views. You never took issue. When invited to criticize my Dallas speech, before I gave it, you had nothing to say that was negative.

Now, you don't want to have anything to do with me. But, John, I hold the same views as always. I don't call you names except to state that I feel that you are somewhat chauvinistic. You characterize me with nastier epithets. See above. But, I respect your right to hold your views and to call me what you will. John, I much want to continue this discourse. I feel that it is valuable to me, and may prove valuable to others.

Be well, and be happy.

VS (2/7/2000)

The killing of President John J. Kennedy and its cover-up are not mysterious. Rather, the assassination was patently a Cold War killing–the bloody work of the U.S. military-intelligence-national-security system. That same power structure and its supporting civilian elite have, since the assassination, worked to cover up the reasons for the killing. Today, those institutions are alive, well and unchanged and continue to maintain and promote the U.S. global empire.

VS (2/8/2000)

Owen, you invite me to comment on the Gold Key Club III.

Fletcher Prouty has described a process which must lead to the death of democracy. How can you have government by the people when you are able to employ covertly several thousand people around the world without arousing suspicions of the taxpayers who are paying them that they are in place and for what purpose they are in place? This is not government by people but government by the intelligence agency which has put them in place. Such operations subvert and do not support a democratic state.

In Fascist Italy, Nazi Germany and Stalin's Russia such operations are in keeping with the nature of the state. As a Fascist, National Socialist, or Stalinist I would heartily support such operations. As a person with a passion for democracy, I abhor them.

MM (2/8/2000)

In response to the recent posts, from my point of view we have made progress. I at least am now looking at the whole Secret Team theory in a completely different light. This is a direct result of the posts from John, Marty, Vince, and Owen. For me, this is a discovery, and it confirms absolutely the value of this continued conversation.

Now, to the substance. My little exercise in logic was not to show off (I told you I got a "D"), but it helped (me, at least), because it simply strips away all the distracting factors. The bottom line of the difference between John and me (and, I think, Marty and Vince) is Premise A: that the "intelligence community" (which we can also read as the "national security state") is "necessary to maintain democracy" (in John's words).

If you accept that premise, you end up with the conclusion that fascism is necessary for democracy. That is a simple and clear and logical syllogism, as I tried to show.

I have asked people to name one thing the CIA ever did that was good. If anybody comes up with anything, let me know. Then we will examine all these one or two (maybe) good things, and balance them against all the evils of the Secret Team that John has described. We will also ask about prices. How much money, and more importantly how much BLOOD, have these wonderful achievements of the CIA cost us? And how much have they cost others, and how do we justify the cost to OTHERS?

But remember, Gentlemen, let's take first things first. Let's get the list of all those good things the CIA et al. have done FOR DEMOCRACY AND LIBERTY. Let's have that list, fellows. John, you can start.

This is not sarcasm, even though it sounds like it, because I think we are really at the crux of the problem. If all the problems we are concerned with are caused by something that is empowered by the intelligence agencies, then clearly the onus is on those who refuse to destroy the intelligence agencies to prove to us, who do want to destroy the intelligence agencies, why the intelligence agencies should not be destroyed.

This is the question we have been round and round about for months. WHAT WE CLEARLY AGREE ON is Premise 2: that the intelligence agencies empower the Secret Team (National Security State). John said it. I agree, and I would be surprised if anybody in this group disagrees.

And then we have the conclusion: fascism is necessary for democracy. May I humbly suggest, though I am not a psychiatrist (believe it or not), that the ineluctability (always wanted to use that word) of this conclusion, and the obvious falsity of it, is enough to drive anybody up the wall? Enough to make them hysterical and insulting?

Look at Chomsky's last letters to me. You can see where he starts losing it. It was when we were precisely at the point of truth–the truth that he was evading, whether purposely or not I'm still not sure. Please look at the letters carefully. You will see that the endpoint was when I pointed out that he contradicted himself on the crucial point in his own book. To me he had refused to admit that there was any kind of policy change after the assassination. Then in the book he documents exactly that change, within days of the assassination. He would deny this, of course, and say it was merely a change of "tactics," not "policy." I had tried to get him to admit that there was at least a radical

change in the situation in Vietnam after the assassination, which then led to the policy change, but he steadfastly refused to accept even these terms. This is precisely what he says and documents in his book, however, and this is what I told him, quoting from his book in his own words.

That was it. The next thing I knew, he was accusing me–perhaps not sardonically–of being an agent and a traitor!

Do you see any similarities with recent events?

I would almost be willing to bet that Chomsky also accepts Premise 1. How could he be a good friend of John Deutsch, otherwise?

Is there any question but that John Newman accepts it, too? With all of his friends and background in intelligence, how could he NOT accept Premise 1? Of course he does. This is what we are dealing with, with Thomas and Newman and perhaps Chomsky. Newman probably honestly thinks he is helping to save the "intelligence community" (NSS), AND THEREFORE DEMOCRACY, by digging out some clues to the identity or identities of the fascist element, the ST.

I have much more respect for Chomsky's intelligence than for Newman's, so it is more difficult for me to believe that he also accepts Premise 1. Where does one go from there?

On the other hand, I am slowly beginning to think that I have misjudged Chomsky's intelligence, and by that I mean simply the ability to comprehend the truth. He does accept Premise A. I have mentioned how he says in the movie *Manufacturing Consent* that the US is "still the freest country in the world." Doesn't that make him a patriot, although he would vehemently deny it? I have said I am a patriot too. But I'm pretty certain that despite all of Chomsky's talk of anarchism, if he were willing to talk to me long enough he would reveal that he advocates very strongly things that I do not, and that one of these things would be the necessity for some kind of intelligence establishment. Perhaps a civilian one, I don't know. In any case, at the end of the line, I suspect he would agree with John Thomas and John Newman that Premise 1 is correct.

I certainly agree with Vince and Marty that the exchanges with John have been fruitful. He represents a mind-set which probably Newman, and maybe Chomsky, share: Premise 1.

To make the discussion easier, we could give names to Premise 1, Premise 2, and the Conclusion, e.g., for Premise 1 I would suggest "Need-to-Know" (NK): some do, most don't. For Premise 2, "Secret Team" (ST). For the conclusion, I would suggest "Crimestop," in honor of Orwell (CS).

I do not contest ST. I do not contest CS. I contest NK.

I have challenged John and anybody else to defend NK. And be prepared for a lengthy discussion.

VS (2/9/2000)

John, first, although you direct your last post to Owen, I got it, and this means you have not eliminated me from your e-mail. Do believe me when I tell you that this comes as an enormous relief to me. Marty and I value you and your thinking immensely. When and if you cut us off from your exchanges, we will feel egregiously deprived of needed intellectual stimulation.

John, as you suspected, I indeed do not see any contradiction between my two posts. The Gold Key Club III speaks of the process by which several thousand people

around the world are put in place by an intelligence agency without suspicions of the taxpayers. But the Gold Key Club III process cannot explain how the club members can operate without the full knowledge of the intelligence institution which hired them, put them in place, extracted from them a life-time oath of allegiance to it with dire executive-action penalties agreed to for violation of their loyalty oath, and continues to arrange for their feeding off the public trough.

In intelligence work, just as in our world, there is no such thing as a free lunch. The computers of intelligence agencies have long memories. I think that the computers have the capacity to keep track for the intelligence agencies of every fat little intelligence piglet who continues to feed off unsuspecting taxpayers.

What would happen should any intelligence piglets step out of line and embarrass the mother agency by killing a President against the explicit structure and mission of the agency? A key would be pushed on some computer, the offending piglets' names and locations would be spelled out on a spread sheet, and the necessary corrective measures would be taken. In that case, people like you and me, truth seekers, would have nothing to do. The work would be done for us by the freedom-loving intelligence agencies.

Is your work done, John? Mine is not.

MM (2/10/2000)

Owen, as you know, I have a great deal of respect for Fletch Prouty. So let's please keep that straight from the beginning. If I talk about his theories, I'm not talking about him. Ok? It's important for you–and for him and me–that you understand this. Unfortunately Fletch can no longer participate actively.

Now, what you are talking about with the shark is what I called in my last post ST. I think we all agree on that. It exists, that Secret Team. AND WE AGREE THAT IT IS "EMPOWERED BY" the intelligence agencies.

We do not have to find the shark. We do not have to identify him (them). We know what empowers them. Therefore, we must destroy that empowering structure. What do you say to that?

MM (2/10/2000)

The reasons why I introduced abbreviations are 1) for clarity and 2) to save words. They go together. The more words, the easier it is to change them in midstream–to argue that "I never said that, I said this," etc. This is called changing the terms of the debate, and it is something we all do when we get in trouble with our argument.

I have simply suggested abbreviating John's argument to the following terms:

X = the intelligence establishment

Y = fascism (the Secret Team, as defined by John)

A = liberty and democracy

The propositions of John's argument can be analyzed as follows:

If A then X, or "The intelligence establishment is necessary to maintain liberty and democracy."

If X then Y, or "The intelligence establishment empowers the evil, fascist element (Secret Team) at the heart of the intelligence establishment."

If A then Y, or "The evil fascist element is necessary to maintain liberty and democracy."

Marty wants to introduce a third term:

B = American institutions and society as a whole.

Marty's proposition is that liberty and democracy are impossible, given B. Liberty and democracy are totally incompatible with American institutions and society as a whole. In other words:

If B then not A.

Now, if this is not Marty's proposition, I ask him to correct it, either in words or symbols.

Since A is the desired goal of all of us (I presume), Marty's proposition requires the destruction of B–that is, the destruction of American institutions and society as a whole.

I do not accept this proposition. I don't think anybody on this list, including Vince (and I'll dig out the quotes if necessary), accepts this proposition. That doesn't mean it is false. Marty is free to defend it. However, I venture to say that no one (Vince included) is going to be interested in Marty's defense of this proposition. I will debate it with you, though, Marty, if you wish.

However, you are leading us down the road to another false debate. The proposition that John has defined, and that I have isolated and described in bare logical terms, is more important, more relevant, and more interesting.

I have asked John, and you, Marty, or anybody else, to defend the proposition that the intelligence establishment is necessary to maintain liberty and democracy. Do you accept that proposition, Marty, or do you reject it? If you reject it, we agree. And that is quite enough for us to agree on. There is no need to introduce a third proposition that you and I know very well in advance that no one in this forum will accept except you.

VS (2/10/2000)

Owen, you say I am wrong when I say that one cannot explain how the Gold Key Club member can operate without the full knowledge of the intelligence institution which hired them. At no point does Prouty say that the CIA loses contact with its agents. As a matter of fact he states that they pick up the bill for paying each of them. How can you pay someone and not know where he is, what his assignment is, what he is doing, and if he is not doing what he is assigned to be doing then how can you not cut off his pay and/or his balls? Well, let's quote from Prouty's *Understanding Special Operations* on this very point [*cf. David T. Ratcliffe, 1999, "Understanding Special Operations and Their Impact on the Vietnam War Era," 1989 interveiw with L. Fletcher Prouty, Colonel USAF (Retired), http://www.ratical.org/ratville/JFK/USO/, Ch. 2. --MDM*]:

Many of these people [CIA agents in place] have reached positions of great responsibility. I believe that the most powerful and certainly the most useful agent the CIA has ever had operates in just such a capacity within another branch of the Government, and he has been there for so long that few have any idea that he is a long-term career agent of the CIA...

This was the plan and the wisdom of the Dulles idea from the beginning. On the basis of security he would place people in all areas of the Government, and then he would move them up and deeper into their cover jobs, until they began to take a very active part in the role of their own organizations. This is how the Secret Team was born. Today, the role of the CIA is performed by an ad hoc organization that is much greater in size, strength, and resources than the CIA has ever been visualized to be (from *The Secret Team*, [NJ: Prentice-Hall, 1973, p. 260]).

Prouty calls this the "wisdom of the Dulles idea." I join with Morrissey in calling this fascism. Not a word here is uttered about losing track of these operatives.

As Mr. Dulles told me later, "I do not want various people from my agency going into the Pentagon... I want a focal point. I want an office that's cleared to do what we have to have done, an office that knows us very, very well and then an office that has access to a system in the Pentagon. But the system will not be aware of who initiated the request–they'll think it came from the Secretary of Defense. They won't realize it came from the Director of Central Intelligence."

The one agency which knows who the person in place is, according to Dulles, who knows them very, very well, is the Agency. Here we see more fascism but no forgetting who the agents in place are.

This leads to another step, what you might call "breeding." We had to work with various agencies of the government, not just the Defense Department. We had to have contact points in the State Department, in the FAA, in the Customs Service, in the Treasury, in the FBI and all around through the government–up in the White House. Gradually we wove a network of people who understood the symbols and the code names and the activities we were doing, and how we handled money which was the most important part. Then we began to assign people there who, those agencies thought, were from the Defense Department, but they actually were people that we put there from the CIA.

This led to the creation of a system of powerful individuals–people whose jobs were quite dominant in some of these other agencies. Especially after they'd been there two or three years, because we put them in there by talking to the top man, the cabinet officer or the head of the agency. We would say, "This man is being placed here so that he can facilitate covert activities and so that he can retain the secrecy that's required, and he will keep you informed at all times." ...So the man we had explained the "Focal Point" structure to, perhaps a year-and-a-half earlier, would be transferred or leave the government. But our trainee and fully cleared "Focal Point" man was still there. So after one or two cycles of this, that agency might not even know that employee was our man and not actually theirs because they would have no record of his special assignment, of what his origins were. They would think he was just another one of their own employees.

The Agency does not lose track. The victimized and subverted government agency, but not the Agency, might lose track. More CIA fascism. But how can any lawyer or any person who knows the principles of agency law not see that the agent in place is the agent of the Agency? And is doing the work of the Agency? And that the Agency is therefore responsible for whatever its agent does whether legally or illegally? And either legally or illegally performed, this work is the antithesis of democratic work? Call this agent anything you want, Secret Team member, anything, but whatever you call him/her that individual is still the servant, agent and employee of the Agency which employs him. The Agency cannot deny responsibility for his/her actions and the actions of the teams in which the individual performs while the Agency is paying him/her. To trace responsibility, you need no sophistication, just follow the money.

As a result, he (the Focal Point person) became extremely effective. Because if we wanted something done–I remember a very sensitive operation that I needed some information on, and I needed it from the FBI. I didn't go to the FBI. I went to this guy that we had planted, and he got it twice as fast and in a much better form than I would have

gotten it from the FBI, even though I was at that time working for the office of the Secretary of Defense. We had no trouble working with the FBI, this process was just to facilitate it and conceal the CIA role. These people became very, very adept.

Please note that Prouty in the context of speaking of agents in place says:

I needed some information... I went to this guy that we [Who is we? The Secretary of Defense? The CIA?] I was at that time working for the office of the Secretary of Defense. [As a CIA agent in place?] ... We [the CIA?] had no trouble working with the FBI, this process was just to facilitate it and conceal the CIA role.

Note, Prouty did not say he was concealing his role in the service of the Secretary of Defense. Rather he is describing concealing his role with the CIA. Yet, he informed us in our correspondence that he never worked for the CIA. Perhaps this is only a function of garbled syntax.

By the same token, people that were bona fide employees of the CIA were assigned even into the office of the Secretary of Defense. We had certain people there who were CIA employees–Ed Lansdale worked for CIA all his adult career... I told Mr. Dulles personally, I said, 'You can make Lansdale a general if you just write a letter to General Le May, because you're going to pay the bills anyway and not the Air Force.

If the CIA pays these fascists, how can they possibly lose track of them? How can the CIA deny responsibility for the actions of these agents in place, if they pay them?

Frank Hand had been there for years in the same way. Frank was a civilian of outstanding ability. I always wrote that he was the most important agent that the agency had because he was operating daily and effectively as a member of the office of the Secretary of Defense. You can just imagine the things that a person in that capacity can do when his home base is really CIA. Although people rarely believe this when they first hear it, there are assignments like that in the White House; there are assignments like that in the State Department. For instance, it's hard to tell the difference, between Bill Bundy who was a long-time CIA employee and his brother McGeorge Bundy who was in the White House with Kennedy. The two brothers certainly are going to act side-by-side–they have the same goals and the same intentions. There were many instances that duplicated like that.

The Bundy brothers were high up in the American Establishment. If Prouty is calling them part of a Secret Team outside of the scope of authority of U.S. governmental policy he has a tough time convincing a guy as stupid as I am of such a proposition. McGeorge Bundy was in charge of the Situation Room of the White House when the presidential plane and the Cabinet Plane were advised that Oswald did it, and there was no conspiracy. Owen, what chance was there that the CIA forgot that Bill was working for them? What chance was there that the CIA had forgotten that McGeorge recruited for them (he did) while at Harvard?

If you asked the American Establishment whether McGeorge was in good standing with it, that august group would have advised you that he was considered its leader. The Secret Team which Prouty is describing is even stronger than the New York Yankees. He can call it the Secret Team. I choose it to call the national security state in its role of maintaining the U.S. global empire. Does it matter what we call it?

It wasn't long–I'd say by the end of the fifties or early sixties–before we had spread through the government what I called a Secret Team, a group of people who really

knew how to operate the CIA business through the boundless maze of the United States government.

Prouty tells us what the Secret Team does. Its job is "to operate the CIA business through the boundless maze of the United States government." It is not operating the Secret Team's business. It is operating the CIA's business. How then, can Prouty say that that Secret Team killed the President, and that the CIA as an institution was not involved? That is sheer nonsense.

Sometimes these people were working in another agency so long we nearly forgot them.

Notice, Owen, Prouty says "nearly forgot them." He never says, and cannot say, that while the CIA was paying them the Agency lost track of and forgot them.

The secret of covert operations is the control of money. And that begins with having a good-sized account. This includes the ability to use it throughout the Government... By 1949, the CIA was able to convince Congress that many of the things it was doing were perfectly legitimate and that many of these legitimate activities cost money because they were paying for people in other Government agencies, they were paying their salaries. As I said, when General Le May promoted Lansdale to be General, it didn't cost the Air Force anything. His paycheck came from CIA. The Air Force paycheck would be torn up. It would go to a certain office where they would destroy it so it didn't cost the Air Force anything.

Is it not clear that covert operations are undemocratic? Is it not clear that Congress is failing its constitutional obligation in authorizing these fascistic expenditures? Is it not clear that the CIA knew where Lansdale was and what he was doing because they were paying him to do what he was doing? Is it not clear that the CIA was responsible for what Lansdale did, including, if he was involved, as Prouty feels he was, in the killing of President Kennedy?

Need I go on? Owen, I can't find a word in Prouty's writing to explain how the CIA computers lose track of their operatives who are receiving the money which this fascist organization usurps from the taxpayer coffers. Show me how the Lansdales, Bundys, and the like get lost in Secret Teams which operate ultra vires from the CIA's direction?

My desire would be for the United States to give up its efforts to do what Prouty in the subtitle of *The Secret Team* says that it does with the help of the CIA: "THE CIA AND ITS ALLIES IN CONTROL OF THE UNITED STATES AND THE WORLD."

Marty and I want us to face up to what Prouty has told us. Prouty tells us that our constitutional structure has been undermined. That the republican principles of our founding fathers have been warped out of shape. Prouty tells us that we are controlling the world through our intelligence and cooperating national security state institutions. He says that this control is enabled by the cooperation of our intimidated presidents, congress, and military-industrial corporations.

Prouty tells us what must be done:

Before it is too late, we Americans must realize this great cancer exists. We must expose if for pro-American reasons; not as a work of anti-Communism. We have been subjected to so many anti-American and pro-Communist notions all in the name of anti-Communism, that words and facts almost elude us (*Secret Team*, p. 425).

...We must end the exploitation of secret intelligence by clandestine operations (p. 416).

…The first twenty-five years of the CIA have given solid evidence of how important the ideas of those legislators in 1947 were. The CIA should be, must be, the "quiet intelligence arm of the President." Not his nightmare. The CIA should be limited to the function of intelligence–and not a bit more (p. 426).

MM (2/10/2000)

Owen, I reject your shark and coral reef analogy with the ST and the CIA. This makes the CIA, as the reef, an innocent, nurturing, delicate, even *precious* entity. It is totally passive, responding only to the needs of all the biology that depends on it as a habitat. Actually, this is exactly what Fletch and others insist the CIA is–merely the "hangmen." If you can call being a hangman "passive," much less innocent, nurturing, etc.

The coral reef does not empower the shark. The shark feeds off the coral reef. The coral reef also serves many other purposes that biologists can tell us are ecologically necessary. That brings us to the question I have asked: What are the good purposes that intelligence agencies serve today?

Tally up the pluses and minuses of the intelligence service's contribution to the "nurturing of life," and you will have nothing at all like a coral reef. First of all, you'll have approximately 6 million dead bodies to deal with–the number David Stockwell attributes to CIA activities since WW II.

Fletch has said that one of the good things the CIA did was rescue the Dalai Lama from Tibet. I haven't thought about that. I suppose it could be a good thing. There are probably other things like that, but I don't remembering him mentioning any others.

So, returning to John's logic, I still say: Destroy the intelligence establishment. That is the first essential step to any kind of transparency (not in Vince's sense!) to government. A daunting enough challenge.

Now, whether you say:

1. Forget the intelligence establishment; let's destroy capitalism, and along with it the whole of American society.

or

2. Forget the intelligence establishment; the fascist elements have long permeated the entire society.

both these positions say: Leave the intelligence establishment alone. I say destroy the entire intelligence establishment. I am waiting for a counter-suggestion, or a reasonable argument as to why this should not be done.

MM (2/11/2000)

Vince, on reflection, I agree with you. This is exactly the point we got to in the paper correspondence with Fletch, who, unfortunately, is no longer able to defend himself, but frankly I don't think it would change the situation if he were. I asked him the same questions at the end of the paper correspondence, and apparently he took them as some kind of "aberration" on my part. You have said what was in my mind very clearly. Thanks.

VS (2/11/2000)

Marty and I have always contended that our work in the JFK assassination is deserving of no credit whatever. I have always described what I have done as self-evident

truth-telling. In my Dallas speech I told you how I started this work. But a certain detail was edited out of my speech. Let me tell you about that.

On November 23rd, 1963, I was talking with my then brother-in-law, Harold Feldman. We discussed Oswald as the accused killer. I told Harold, "I don't know now whether the accused assassin is the or an assassin. But, if Oswald is killed this weekend by a Jew, then we will have a lot of work to do."

What I was saying elliptically was that if Oswald was killed quickly, while in captivity, then he had to be silenced by the forces behind the killing. Therefore, Oswald was a patsy. I knew that it would take powerful forces to kill a President and then to select a patsy and to have him killed in captivity. If a Jew were chosen to dispatch the patsy, I knew that the CIA was the likely executioner of the President. I knew that the CIA, an elite WASP organization, would choose a Jew in order to intimidate into silence the left, which at that time was largely Jewish. I knew that we would have work to do, because I recognized immediately that our government which was involved in the killing would be lying to us about the assassination.

From then on, using this model of explanation, I merely fed off what the governmental and civilian institutions gave me. From the governmental and media handling of these data I was able to confirm that the assassination was indeed a national security state institutional crime.

But soon, from an offer that was made to me, I saw that the CIA was quite willing to have me continue on the microanalytic analysis of the assassination data. The offer from an obvious CIA operative was for me to stop publishing in the tiny magazines which were printing my articles, and accept access to the major U.S. magazines.

I then quit the microanalysis. I pleaded guilty to having remained too long on the subject of how the assassins had killed Kennedy. I switched to writing about why the CIA had killed him. It was then that I was able to sense fully how much one could learn from the assassination work about the U.S. power structure and its Cold War modus operandi.

My life was threatened. But I was willing to give that up. I realized that the taking of my life might cause people to focus on my work and to increase their understanding of the historical significance of the assassination. Apparently, the CIA felt it was better to leave the likes of Salandrias undisturbed. But for a rare and courageous journalist such as Gaeton Fonzi, we had no access to the media. What we were saying would go unnoticed by the population at large.

The empire was still delivering its benefits to us as citizens. Salandria could be used as an example of how free the society is. I would be permitted to become rich. I could enjoy life. My life has been truly wonderful and filled with loving friends such as Ralph Brown and Marty Schotz. I have enjoyed free speech. An old-fashioned totalitarian government, such as Stalin's Russia, would have disappeared my friends and me in a rush. So what is my gripe with the system which has afforded me such wealth and privilege? What is my gripe with a system which has permitted me to be educated out of my Italian ghetto of origin and has allowed me to criticize the power structure of a society which has been so generous to me? What other Establishment would have allowed me charge it with murder and then allowed me to live my life?

I have no personal gripe with the way the society has treated me. But I know that my wealth accumulates not from my labors, but from the backs of others. I know that if I were born into a poor black ghetto today, I would not have much of a chance of attending

an Ivy League university. As I grow richer, I take note in this morning's *Philadelphia Inquirer* that in 1988 the median taxable income for a Philadelphia tax filer was $22,124.00 and by 1997, it was down to an inflation adjusted $18,999.00.

When Kennedy was killed, although I was a lawyer, by choice I was teaching social studies in a comprehensive Philadelphia high school in a working-class area. Because I feared greater military control after the assassination, I warned my students that as a consequence of the Kennedy killing, Vietnam would heat up. I begged them to do what they could to avoid fighting there. Some of my students have told me that through my teaching I had saved their lives. Others, in spite of my teaching, killed and were killed in Vietnam. My fears were realized.

When Kennedy was killed, I feared that death-squad activity would increase in South and Central America. I feared that we would pursue the Cold War by burgeoning our military expenditures in an effort to bankrupt the Soviets. Now, the average life span of a Russian male is 58 years. My fears were realized.

When Kennedy was killed, I feared that we would accelerate the killing of foreign heads of state, the blockading and bombing of peoples, the buying up of foreign legislatures, and the supporting of relatively unfettered global capitalism which utilized for maximization of profit child labor and which caused the environment to deteriorate. My fears were realized.

When Kennedy was killed, I feared that the racial integration movement would be fractured and its leaders assassinated. I feared that our urban public schools would cease to provide our poor city youths with fine public schools. I feared that our city schools would no longer enable these students to grow into adulthood as active and informed democratic citizens. My fears were realized.

Why do I persist in seeking to bear witness to the truth, although the empire remains intact and continues to provide largesse to our citizens? Why do I persist when we are unwilling and unable given the present state of U.S. politics to fight successfully and to defeat Kennedy's powerful killers? I persist because by telling the truth I separate myself from being an accessory after the fact to a still active murder case. Because if I obfuscated the truth, I would join the assassins by covering the source of and motive for the assassination.

I persist in seeking to bear witness to the truth because I feel that only through confronting and accepting the truth can a society seek to reconstruct itself and seek to achieve societal health. I persist, because as a non-violent person, I have but one weapon with which to engage power in order to seek to bring about a more peaceful, equal and equitable society. That weapon is the truth.

MM (2/13/2000)

I'm glad we have gotten onto Fletch Prouty's case. It might sound as if we are attacking him personally, but it is definitely not personal. I have a great deal of respect for Fletch Prouty. He has taught me a lot. We had a voluminous correspondence. I have met him on two occasions. I think I'm the one who put Oliver Stone on to him, and I'm glad I did. I do not hesitate to say that Fletch has been one of the most important influences on my life, along with Vince Salandria and Noam Chomsky. (And when I say Vince, I mean him AND the other people in this group I have been talking with, because this is the context in which I have known him.)

We are at the point where we were when Fletch left us. Actually, I'm just as glad he's not here, and that Owen can sort of take his place, because hard as we might try to make him believe that we are not attacking him personally, I wonder if he could ever believe it. I would feel very uncomfortable in that situation, because it would jeopardize our friendship–and I still consider him a friend, though I suppose I won't hear from him again.

When I look at Fletch Prouty, I see a human being in uniform. The purpose of the uniform, of course, is to disguise the human being as a machine, but I think Fletch, after the assassination, shed the disguise, literally and figuratively, and has spent his writing career fighting what he is honestly and sincerely convinced is the good fight. And he has fought it well. As I said, I have learned a lot from him, and so have many others.

However, despite Fletch having the very best of intentions, it is still possible that his struggle has served other purposes in addition to his own. Fletcher taught me the expression cui bono. I don't believe I knew it before he used it somewhere. This is the way we have to see the questions Marty and Vince are asking. Who benefits from Fletch's struggle–besides people like me and Owen and Oliver Stone, who learn from him?

Marty and Vince are saying the very same enemy that Fletch is fighting also benefits from this struggle, although Fletch may not recognize it. (I wouldn't be sure of that at all, though, because Fletch is a very intelligent man, and I can imagine him saying, "Yes, the enemy may also benefit, but at least this way I am doing some good for the other side as well." And this is a defensible point of view.)

It is true that the notion of a mysterious, ever evasive Secret Team, and even more mysteriously and evasively above and controlling them, a High Cabal, operating within an innocent intelligence and military Establishment is attractive, because it allows us to think that everything is basically ok. We just need to find those bad apples in the Secret Team and throw them out.

But what is our hope against the High Cabal? None whatever, I would say, since we have no idea who they are (Sullivan Cromwell, Boston Banks, etc.–all that is a wild goose chase par excellence) and never will.

It is quite possible to live with this idea, and obviously many people do. These are the "conspiracy theorists" the media correctly see everywhere. They all believe in a High Cabal of some sort, although the identity and purpose of the Cabal varies wildly from theory to theory.

But, as I asked Fletch in one of our last exchanges, why worry about the High Cabal or the Secret Team when we've got a real, visible, tangible enemy to blame–"the CIA and it's allies in control of the United States and the world," as Fletch called it. He said the subtitle of the book was the publisher's idea. He meant what he has said explicitly more than once–that actually it is not the CIA and it's allies at all in control of the US and the world, but the High Cabal. The CIA is just the "hangman" (his term).

Fletch would be the best person I can think of to answer the question I asked Owen, and which I am now going to make a point of asking everybody I talk to: Is the intelligence establishment necessary to maintain liberty? I think there is no question but that he would say yes. He has written this somewhere. The CIA should get out of covert operations, or operations period, and concentrate only on information gathering, as per its original charter.

Now, what could be wrong with that point of view? Nothing, maybe–if it is true that we need an intelligence establishment with sub-rosa powers to gather information. I think it is becoming clear that all of the people we have been discussing do in fact share this belief: John Thomas (who said it), no doubt John Newman, no doubt Fletch Prouty, and probably Noam Chomsky, too.

There we are. Once you accept the assumption that an intelligence establishment is necessary (for whatever purposes), you accept secret government. You empower the government with a secret, fascist weapon, the Secret Team, to use against you as well as against supposed enemies of the state. That is John's second assumption (proposition), and no one has disagreed with it. The differences are with the first one.

So, it's not complicated after all. What we need is for people like John Thomas, John Newman, Fletch Prouty, and yes, Noam Chomsky to tell us why we need any secrets at all in government, and if we do, how they should be kept. I believe if we do this rigorously, we will conclude that 99.9% of the secrets should not be secrets at all. That removes all justification for the intelligence establishment. Away with them, cat, kit and caboodle.

Let's start with Fletch's remark that the CIA should be restricted to information gathering. He could probably come up with a lot of military secrets that need to be kept. I would like to discuss these, every single one of them, in great detail. I would not give an inch, on a single detail, without being thoroughly convinced of the absolute necessity of allowing some group or institution to know something that I am not allowed to know. That is my bottom line. What right does anyone have to know something I don't know that affects my life directly, that I should know, and that he is keeping me from knowing? Why should I give away that right, or simply accept the fact that I don't have it? Am I a slave or a human being?

I am a slave, of course, like the rest of us, but that doesn't mean I can't strive to be free. How can we be free if we have powerful institutions whose purpose is to know things that we are not allowed to know? How could this kind of power possibly be kept "non-operational"? This is in contradiction to our (John's) second proposition, that the intelligence establishment empowers abuse. You CANNOT separate information gathering from "operations." That is the point I would start from. Maybe I could be convinced to compromise–but I would insist on being convinced. I do insist on being convinced.

Aren't I talking about what Gorbachev called GLASNOST? I have always been very impressed with Gorbachev. I think he was removed by the same forces that removed JFK et al.

What forces? There we are, back to the big question, the answer to which I think is unknowable unless we rid ourselves of the basic assumption that the intelligence establishment is necessary.

Owen, you said in a previous post that getting rid of the CIA et al. wouldn't do much good, because the Secret Team has already permeated the entire society. This is very close to what Marty is saying, I think, when he says that the question of whether an intelligence establishment is necessary to defend liberty presumes that there is liberty to defend. What is there left worth preserving in the American system of government, or American society, which Ramsey Clark, the former Attorney-General of the United States, says is not a democracy but a plutocracy?

I will gladly discuss all sorts of radical reforms of the system of government, but I think that is putting the cart before the horse. First let's put into question, and get rid of, the secret government, which is what we have now. Let's have Glasnost. That means abolishing the entire intelligence "community." Then, and only then, can we hope to reform the rest of the system.

Does that mean abolish the military, too? Can you have a military without secrets? The answer to both these questions may well be "No." That doesn't mean we need an intelligence establishment, however. The military secrets that really need to be kept secret may amount to, as I said, .01% of all the things we are now prohibited from knowing.

I know that we cannot accomplish these things, but I'm looking for a common point of view.

VS (2/14/2000)

Owen, Marty is not upset with you. The group has lasted for years because in our exchanges thinking occurs. Thinking occurs along with much feeling. The strong feeling comes from seeing ourselves in our relation to our correspondents, our country and reexamining who we are and to what and to what extent our commitment to the truth about the JFK killing extends.

Owen, your post is filled with possibilities and guesses. You speak of what Dulles knew about the Secret Team being bigger and more effective than the institutional organization. We know that U.S. intelligence at that time had some 30 billion dollars annually with which to manipulate the world. What evidence does Prouty or do you offer that there was a Secret Team which was "bigger and more effective than the institutional organization called the Central Intelligence Agency?" Please, don't offer up a speculation as "very possible" without offering some evidence to support the speculation.

I next suggested to you that: Prouty tells us what the Secret Team does. Its job is "to operate the CIA business through the boundless maze of the United States Government." It is operating the CIA's business. How then, can Prouty say that the Secret Team killed the President, and the CIA as an institution was not involved? That is sheer nonsense.

You answered me with "I suggest that..." Again, Owen, I am not interested in your suggestions unless they derive from evidence. Where is your evidence to contravene what Prouty says, which is that the Secret Team's job is operating the CIA business? You offer no evidence.

You next wrote of black budgets and paper trails known only to a select few, phony sets of books, rogue elements. All of this may be subject of interest in spy novels. But where is your evidence for drawing some relevant conclusion? There is no suggestion of evidence and no suggestion of a relevant conclusion to be drawn.

You next wrote of heroin and cocaine, and boxcar planes with schedules that would make Fed-Ex blush. You ask me whether "this" is with the blessing of the "institution of the CIA"? And that I can't have "it" both ways. I don't know what the antecedents of "this" and "it" is or are, so how can I continue a coherent thought process with you?

You next asked about LBJ selecting Allen Dulles for the Warren Commission. You suggest that "Maybe Bundy made the suggestion?" And what is the value of this

suggestion? "Maybe" without any evidence is useless and unfocused speculation not worthy of seeing print even on e-mail.

I said if Prouty was calling the Bundy brothers part of a Secret Team outside of the scope of authority of U.S. governmental policy, he would have a tough time convincing a guy as stupid as I am of such a proposition.

You answered that what you, Owen Rogers, were suggesting was that they had to be part of a secret team. But who do you think worked on the drafts of NSAM #273, Nov. 21st/63.

We know that Bill Bundy was officially employed at that time with the CIA. Why should we conclude that McGeorge Bundy was serving the interests of a Secret Team and not serving the U.S. Establishment of which he was the leader, and serving the CIA, for whom he was recruiting when he was at Harvard?

Owen, in my 1:32 PM 2/10/00 post I put to you a number of questions which I think tend to disprove the existence of a Secret Team that was not within the knowledge and control of the CIA. You have not answered the material. The material which I used to frame my questions to you was drawn directly from Prouty's writings. I consider your answers to my questions non-answers. Please, try to address my questions sharply, insightfully and honestly the way that Marty answers my questions and the questions of others. There is nothing personal in my reference back to my post of 1:32 PM 2/10/00. If you find me ruthless in the manner in which I address you, be assured that it only goes to my need to dig hard and without mercy for the truth.

John, you state: "I will accept nothing more than an absolute rejection of such a preposterous accusation as Schotz's ("with the assassins"), and a disassociation of yourself with his remarks."

You, John, had accused me of much worse. According to you I am seeking "the overthrow of the US government, or more correctly the absolute destruction of America as a global power." You say I am "perfectly content to leave in place the Secret Team and other clandestine operations that pollute our intelligence communities, frustrate our democracy and threaten our liberty," and that "we do not know whether this is genuine, or a device by which, in channeling our discussion towards the improbably bizarre, they can keep truth seeking from realistic investigation. In CIA baby sitter parlance, this is known as 'keeping them on the reservation.'"

I do not ask you for an apology for the above, because I know that none of these charges are remotely true about me, and no one will believe them. If you believe them, I do not become angered by the charges. Nor do I hold the charge against you. Rather, I sympathize with you, because your anger is causing your fine mind to think wrongly.

John, what is going on? I have not changed a wit from when you knew me. I have always accused anyone who will not recognize that the military-intelligence Cold War national security state killed Kennedy that such a non-recognition amounts to a witting or unwitting aiding of the assassins.

With the certainty that I bore you, I will repeat that theme which ran through my Dallas speech of November, 1998.

For one half of my seventy years, from almost the very date of the assassination, I have been convinced that the killing of President Kennedy was a patent Cold War killing–the bloody work of the U.S. military-intelligence system and its supporting civilian power elite.

For us to allow thirty-five years to pass, while debate rages on the subject, is not only an abdication of the required work of a democratic citizenry, but the debate itself actively serves the interests of the assassins. Such debate masks the damage done to the constitutional structure by the extra-constitutional firing of the President.

President Kennedy himself had posited that he might be killed by the national security state, as reported in Paul B. Fay, Jr.'s book, *The Pleasure of his Company*. Given the simplicity of the above analysis, the conclusion is inescapable that the American civilian media failed in its First Amendment task of seriously examining the killing of President Kennedy by the military-intelligence community. The U.S. media chose instead to serve the interests of state. That rightfully earns them the title of accessories after the fact.

The effect of the government's deceit has been to create a confused and extremely protracted debate designed to hide the simple truth of a high level warfare-state conspiracy.

The assassination of President Kennedy and its handling by the government and its compliant media were designed to accomplish not only the firing by gunshots of a President, but also were aimed at mind-manipulation and paralysis of our people. The fact that we have been debating this assassination for thirty-five years demonstrates that the national security state has enjoyed considerable success in accomplishing its goal. By debating the meaning of the assassination of President Kennedy we have served the purpose of our military-intelligence complex to mystify the obvious.

We now understand the deep significance of President Kennedy's killing. Our cities blight while we build B-2 bombers and an unattainable but military-industrial-profit-generating anti-ballistic missile system. Our poor suffer miserable existences as we continue to fatten the military-industrial complex for protection against imagined or impotent enemies. Our public schools in the urban areas decay while we maintain military bases through the globe. We desperately search for terrorists and weak nation states which we can designate as "rogue states" and therefore make them necessary targets for our Pentagon to show off its new weapons systems.

By coming to understand the true answer to the historical question of who killed President Kennedy and why, we will have developed a delicate and precisely accurate prism through which we can examine how power works in this militarized country. By understanding the nature of this monumental crime, we will become equipped to organize the struggle through which we can make this country a civilian republic in more than name only. Until we understand the nature of the Kennedy assassination, and until we express the truth openly on this vital aspect of our history, we will continue to be guilty participants in the vast amount of state criminality involved in the killing of President Kennedy and its cover-up.

You, John, did not take issue with one word of my thesis set forth in my speech. Here is part of your answer (5/26/98) to my request for criticism:

I am honored to be asked by you to review your speech draft...

...I was as much astounded by the fact of the truth of conspiracy in the assassination as I was dumfounded by the studied avoidance of those "researching" it to reach perfectly obvious conclusions.

And so in writing my letter to the "Third Decade" I felt rather like that little boy who proclaimed that the emperor was buck naked...Society immediately rushes in to extinguish honesty when power says it is impermissible to notice that which is obvious.

The boy is cowed into silence. His elders disapprove. His friends laugh uncomfortably at his daring foolishness. He learns the lesson. He may not understand why, but he knows he is to avoid this subject at all costs. Power wins again.

In my case, though, a strong voice came out of the wilderness. The voice said to me: "Hey, Thomas: You're on target! Nobody else will tell you, but you are right. The emperor's pulling a con on you. Good work for noticing! Take heart in your reasoning ability. If you will accept the results of your observations, you can begin to understand the world of power." The voice of course was yours. It was the voice of reason and truth....

So I ask the voice for proof of its soundness. The voice invites me in to meet those other voices he has surrounded himself with. They are all honest and intelligent people. Their discourse is many levels above those in the forest. They have survived with their intelligence, integrity and sanity intact for many years. They do not need the support of the "insiders." They have created a safe haven for the healthful disputation of ideas that leads to truth....

Arming a person with these verities, as you did me, Vince, is a true lifelong gift....

There will be many others like me out there in that audience. These people–innocent as yet of the certainty we share–will be struggling with whether or not they have the courage to believe what Jim Douglass called "The Unthinkable." They will at times have drawn close and held tentatively to these courageous, honest conclusions. But they are subjected to the withering examples of acquiescence in eternal debate by others whom they admire and respect. They think, Wecht and DiEugenio and Newman and Scott and Aguilar and other notables head this group, and they are honorable men. This group entertains, for example, Paul Hoch's ideas, so Paul Hoch must be an honorable man. Hoch says Alvarez was right and science is wrong, so Alvarez's theory must be an honorable one...

...Vincent, my friend, you are the best antidote in the world to that kind of bullshit.. For half of your life you, an honorable man, have stood openly, peacefully, and resolutely for the simple purpose of getting beyond the wilderness of mirrors, tossing off microanalysis, and focusing instead on the real issues which are (a) what are the implications of this coup d'etat?, b) how and why is the cover-up being sustained?, and (c) what is to be done?

...I'm afraid that you do not see those things which are very special about you precisely because they are second nature to you. And I feel the things you really stand for really need to be said.

John, I have not changed. Why have you? You characterize the JFK murder as a coup d'etat. As you know, a coup d'etat is defined as a sudden, forcible overthrow of a government. Why do you defend now so vigorously a government which came to power with the overthrow of Kennedy because of his efforts to come to grips with our national security state? Why do you now part company with me when we were one at the time I was preparing that speech? Why do you now consider my approach to the JFK assassination expressed in that speech as irrational when even Chomsky declared it lucid?

Why do separate yourself from that audience in Dallas which gave me a standing ovation for the analysis which you now consider irrational?

Please communicate. I have not charged you with anything that you did not know or have reason to know you would be charged with when you read my speech. When you perused that speech you had to know that if you pushed the Secret Team concept at me, I would consider you as aiding and abetting the assassins. As you can readily see by reading the above, I said that very clearly in my speech. Why take umbrage now? Why should I apologize and thereby retreat from a speech which I feel now, and you once felt, tells the truth about the Kennedy assassination? Yes, I feel that to tell less than the full truth about the JFK killing causes one to join knowingly or unknowingly with the assassins as a criminal accessory after the fact to an active murder case with major historical implications.

The reason for telling less than the truth may appear to be a good one. Certainly a Mafia-rogue CIA elements, or Secret Team concept would have a better chance of flying as a flag around which citizens would be more inclined to rally than my thesis of a national security state assassination. But for me to take that step would join me in departing from what I know to be the truth. For me to take such a step would place my foot in the same camp tent occupied by the assassins. That fateful step I cannot take. John, I am convinced that you, as an honest man, would never take such a step wittingly.

VS (2/15/2000)

Several of you are proposing various social actions which you wish to have the group collaborate with in order to enlighten the public regarding the Kennedy assassination and/or related matters. I feel that some of you must have been disappointed in my not joining enthusiastically in the support of these ideas. Please allow me to explain for myself why I have been sitting on my haunches.

I feel that our society does not have the necessary political readiness to act politically on the truth behind the assassination of President Kennedy. Therefore, I view my work in the assassination as simply bearing witness to the truth irrespective of the political implications and consequences of such truth telling. I do not have a workable political program to offer anyone. I see my role as a critic of the national security state power. As a social actionist I rate myself as a flat zero.

With respect to the projects proposed by a number of you, I think of them as somewhat quixotic. I desperately wish that I am wrong. I wish that your projects, if carried out, would help to move people to progressive political action which will produce a more open, fairer and democratic nation and to a better world. But my wish aside, I am convinced that the power structure will easily defeat any such efforts and in the process exhaust your energies and resources.

You see, I feel, and have always felt, that the people at some level of consciousness, and despite their need not to know, have always reluctantly understood the meaning of the JFK assassination as well as I have. When I publicly spoke on this subject in 1964 and for years thereafter, I never met with any opposition. The first real opposition I have ever received was from John and Owen. When I spoke in Dallas in November of 1998 everyone, including the agents, rose to applaud. No one took me on.

Then you would ask me, why do the people, if they have this knowledge, not do battle with the assassins and their successors and assigns? This is explained in Marty Schotz's book, *History Will Not Absolve Us*.

The fact that our press and universities fell into line is an indication that they too accepted American democracy as delimited by this liberal-conservative Establishment.

Are the American people really any different? Do they really want to know what happened and take responsibility, as opposed to indulging themselves in endless speculation?

Warren Commission member John J. McCloy is quoted by Edward J. Epstein in *Inquest* as saying that the paramount importance of the Commission was to "show the world that America is not a banana republic where a government can be changed by conspiracy." Nowhere has the primary concern of the Establishment been more honestly acknowledged in this case.

...And on this score, in deciding to handle the assassination as they did, the left/liberal Establishment revealed that when push came to shove, when they had to make a choice, the left/liberal Establishment was more addicted to the military and the CIA than to the Constitution. And by and large the American people are part and parcel of this addiction.

...in practical terms, the quality of American democracy is ultimately up to the American people to determine. And the people for now are dominated by the "powers that be" and their press. For American democracy to return to being governed by the Constitution, instead of by the mentality of the Cold War, will mean confronting truly vast forces that will stand in opposition. Such a process can only proceed on the basis of a broad social movement which is prepared to challenge the political assumptions of our society at its roots. Along the way such a movement will inevitably want to know everything it can about the illness it must overcome.

I believe that as people become part of such a movement they will want to know, they will need to know, who killed President Kennedy and why and how the murder was covered up. They will need to know because they will be struggling to overcome the Orwellian forces that today dominate our nation and the world. And this case is a window on those forces. So no matter if our work is ignored today, it will have something to offer people eventually.

Am I a captive of Marty Schotz's thinking? Is he a captive of my thinking? I would urge that we are both free individuals who have learned to love one another because we have helped one another to understand and to express the truth irrespective of the marginalizing effect of this Odyssey.

So, expect little from us as social actionists. Who would be willing to follow the likes of us into political battle? Not I!

VS (2/15/2000)

Owen, I am aware that you have stopped talking to me, but in the interests of historical accuracy I feel that I must address you on the issue of Prouty and Garrison. Jim Garrison's view of the assassination conformed to mine and not to Prouty's. I never heard Jim once mention a Secret Team. Jim accepted totally my view of a Cold War assassination carried out by the CIA acting as an institution and through its duly authorized agents who, operating within the scope of the authority assigned to them by the CIA, killed President Kennedy. Marty was right when he wrote in *History Will Not Absolve Us* that "Garrison was unflinchingly pointing directly at the CIA as the source of the assassination conspiracy,..." (p. 13).

For proof of that thesis, kindly read Jim's *Heritage of Stone*, which I edited and in part wrote. It bears a copyright date of 1970. Prouty's *Secret Team* bears a copyright date of 1973. Jim in his book offered one and a quarter pages of acknowledgements and listed me first. Prouty was not mentioned. Jim later described me as his mentor, a copy of which designation was mailed to our committee of correspondence. Therefore, it is wrong to equate Prouty's view of the assassination with that of Jim Garrison and to suggest that Prouty was the mentor of Jim Garrison. He was not. What I am articulating as my view of the assassination was completely accepted by Jim.

To prove that Garrison and I were one on the assassination I quote from Chapter 10, the concluding chapter of *Heritage of Stone*:

THE WAR MACHINE

The means of defense against foreign danger historically, have become the instruments of tyranny at home. –James Madison

After the Eulogy

One of the most remarkable accomplishments of the Roman Emperor Augustus has been said to be that he maintained the form of the republic for the people to see while actually transferring ever more power to the armed forces. This well may be history's judgment of Lyndon Johnson, who repeatedly recited his craving for peace while hundreds of thousands of combat troops were flown to Vietnam.

On Sunday afternoon, two days after John Kennedy's assassination, the new President met with the ambassador to Vietnam...The body of the late President still rested on the black-draped catafalque at the Rotunda of the Capitol.

The new President informed the ambassador that he was not going to lose Vietnam, that he was not going to see Southeast Asia go the way China went. This was nothing less than a complete reversal of the policy of withdrawal which had been announced and put into action by the late President whose body still lay in state at the Capitol. It contemplated nothing less than the inevitable involvement of major U.S. forces in Asia, inasmuch as it had long been apparent that the South Vietnamese forces could not hold their own against the Viet Cong and the North Vietnamese.

Even before John Kennedy had been buried, then, the decision had been made for our major involvement in Asia. Had the United States government been an innocent party with regard to President Kennedy's murder–which the available evidence, as well as its own conduct, its effort to conceal evidence and obstruct outside inquiry, indicate was not the case–such a decision would have required an infinitely longer period of evaluation and analysis. The decision to reverse John Kennedy's plan for withdrawal from Vietnam would not have been reversed with such immodest speed.

...Then information was transmitted to the Commission that Waggoner Carr, the Texas Attorney General, and Henry Wade, the Dallas District Attorney, had evidence that Lee Harvey Oswald had been an intelligence employee of the United States government...

However, nothing more was forthcoming about this from the government. Its answer to any questions would come in the form of a change in foreign policy. In August, the Tonkin Gulf Resolution was obtained from Congress, authorizing the President to take whatever military action he desired to protect American troops. As a practical matter, the authority to make this decision ended up in the hands of the military itself,

making it quite predictable that it would be found necessary to take action to protect the troops....

In retrospect, it is apparent that what was under way was the classic buildup of the warfare state. Ultimately, the provocative incident occurs or is caused to occur and paternal concern forces the larger country to defend its troops.

...In this instance, the incident concerned the possible firing of torpedoes at two American destroyers... According to later accounts there was no observation of any torpedoes... The entire affair bore the distinct aroma of a military and intelligence tableau. Nevertheless, it was sufficient for the President to appear before Congress and request the power to prevent further aggression against American armed forces.

The Open Road to War

The warfare state operates at two different levels. This is necessary because the interests of the power elite frequently are unrelated to the interests of the people at large. There is what might be called the practical level, which is usually hidden from the view of the populace, and the lovable level, arranged for all to see.

The napalm bombing of a Vietnam village is an operation conducted on the practical level...

The execution of President Kennedy was an operation conducted at the practical level. He was blocking the thrust of Pax Americana. He was bringing to an end the cold war, the existence of which was the source of power for the Pentagon and the Central Intelligence Agency.

The magnificent military funeral held for him three days later was an operation conducted on the lovable level. The government was demonstrating to the people that they lived in the best of all possible superstates.

Soon the United States government would be engaged in two major projects. At the lovable level for all the world to see were the Warren Commission hearings, presided over by the silver-haired Chief Justice. At this level the government was playing the role of an anxious parent, seeking to find an answer to the mystifying murder of its late President. Meanwhile, at the practical level the government would undertake a massive buildup of an American expeditionary army in Vietnam. The buildup would continue until more than a half a million troops had been sent there.

...Actually, however, Congress was being manipulated. This is how the war machine operates. Behind the seeming concern for national security are the busy men with bulging briefcases hurrying from the Pentagon over to Capitol Hill, the tight-mouthed men hurrying from CIA headquarters over to the Pentagon; it is eventually a game. It is an operation designed to produce for the warfare sector of its military hardware supporters billions of dollars annually and unlimited power in the affairs of the nation.

... Could the CIA kill a President to keep such an operation going? Kings have been beheaded for infinitely less.

Approximately a month after President Kennedy's assassination, former President Harry Truman made the observation that the CIA appeared to be engaged in activities far beyond the scope initially intended for it. This was something of an understatement.

...For the CIA, its primary objective is to enhance its power. In combination with the military, to maintain and extend its power, it has sought to keep the cold war going. To a warfare state a war is a market–a market for the services of its military and for the

hardware manufacturers. We became a warfare state years earlier at the close of World War II...

Then suddenly there was John Kennedy–too wealthy, too idealistic and too hardheaded to manipulate–talking about peace for all time for all men. ...

But Kennedy was different: he was a President preparing for peace, no war, and he was moving too fast. There had been his refusal to approve American air support at the Bay of Pigs and his refusal to respond to the Cuban missile crisis by bombing Cuba. There had been the signing of the nuclear test ban treaty on September 1, ordered by him over the objection of the majority of the Joint Chiefs. Then there had been his initiation of détente with Cuba and Russia. Now he was blocking the new war market in Vietnam.

The Central Intelligence Agency handled all of the details.

The Coup d'Etat

For years we in America have heard much of the communist conspiracy to dominate the world....

...With the killing of John Kennedy, the very position of the Presidency was drastically reduced in status. Henceforth, the President would be a broker for the war machine. He would be an advocate and spokesman for the Pentagon. All Presidents who followed Kennedy would have to know their impotence, no matter what their public role.

Until the work of the Kennedy assassins is undone, Presidents will come and go but the warfare machine and its extensive intelligence tentacles, domestic as well as foreign, will remain in control. ...

The assassination resulted in insulating the people from making decisions over foreign policy and war....Foreign policy was being made by the Pentagon and the CIA...

A Model of Explanation

A case has been offered to enable the people to examine the reasons for his murder....The fact that the same men continue to control the Pentagon, the CIA and the FBI, which helped to conceal the CIA's handiwork after the assassination, indicates that the war-oriented interests are still in firm control and that nothing can be expected from the government except more untruths and more war. This course will be reversed only when the American public unites in understanding the truth about the assassination of John Kennedy and in undertaking dignified action that will restore the republic.

...It is inconceivable that men high in our government today are not fully aware of what really happened to John Kennedy and why it happened. If it can be understood outside Washington, it can be understood in Washington. Yet their sophisticated silence remains unbroken as they continue to play the game that all is well in America.

Their continued silence is eloquent testimony that the military and intelligence power elite, which sponsored the assassination and which then initiated the Vietnam escalation continues to retain covert control of the nation. ...

Dealey Plaza Revisited

...In any event, we need no longer pretend that there is any mystery left about the assassination of John Kennedy. The cold war was the biggest business in America, worth eighty billion dollars a year as well as tremendous power to men in Washington. The President was murdered because he was genuinely seeking peace in a corrupt world. As tired as we are of the horror of the subject, all of us must address ourselves honestly to the meaning and implications of the assassination of John Kennedy, or all of us will pay the price of living in tyranny.

Appendix

"And the wonder is that Khrushchev–who had once confronted him in a decisive test and learned to recognize both his determination and his wisdom–also believed it. ...But Nikita Khrushchev's reaction to the news of that tragedy showed clearly what hopes he had placed in his understanding, one would be tempted to say his connivance, with the young President. He burst into tears, and according to the testimony of a high Soviet official quoted by Pierre Salinger, 'He just wandered around his office for several days, like he was in a daze.' As a matter of fact his sorrow was the sorrow of all humanity" (Andre Fontaine, *History of the Cold War from the Korean War to the Present*, trans. by Renaud Bruce [New York: Pantheon Books, 1959], pp. 474-75.

I set forth the above not to garner any credit for myself, because Jim is the sole hero of the piece. He is the only public figure in the world who expressed himself and acted publicly and honestly on the assassination. I count for nothing in terms of importance, and I deserve no credit. But, I do not take kindly to having Prouty's work represented as expressing the views of Jim Garrison. Jim and I were able to speak clearly and to understand one another and to come to perfect agreement. The relationship I had with Jim was in that respect not unlike that which I have with Marty Schotz. Jim and I never argued. Jim had a grace and class about him which Marty has never acquired. But understandings arrived at between Jim and me, had the feeling of having been bonded with reinforced cement, much like my understandings arrived at with Marty.

So, Owen, in the interests of accurate history, please distinguish between Prouty's view of the assassination and that of Garrison. The gap is enormously wide. And please, Owen, be certain to point out in the future that Prouty did not help Garrison to formulate his view on how and why and by whom Kennedy was killed. Garrison's hostile view of the warfare state was crystal clear. Prouty's view is blurred by identity with and love for that state.

VS (2/16/2000)

Owen, what we are discussing is, in my judgment, important stuff. More important than friendship. To the extent that parting company with someone's ideas causes friendship to be lost, so be it. When those ideas have major implications for life and liberty here and abroad, then a socially responsible person expresses his/her thoughts and vehemently.

You ask me how I can say that "Prouty's view is blurred by identity with and love for that state."

Prouty's Acknowledgements speak to his love for the intelligence elements of that state:

to Allen W. and John Foster Dulles, General Charles P. Cabell, General Graves B. Erskine, General Victor H. (Brute) Krulak for close personal relationships that shaped the course of these events,

and to the hundreds of men with whom I shared these experiences and who must remain nameless and silent because that is the "code" of their chosen profession.

That Prouty loves this country, which is so dependent for its superpower dominance on its national security state, more than the truth about the assassination is set forth by him on page 420 of *The Secret Team*:

Lest anyone wish to raise the suggestion that Lyndon B. Johnson should have made hard, bold, and decisive moves during those fragile and explosive days, [following

Kennedy's assassination] let him recall the frightful days in 1968 after the life of Martin Luther King had been snuffed out by another assassin's bullet. The country was very close to real trouble. Law and order was destroyed, and things were out of control in many major cities. The racial riots inspired by the loss of Martin Luther King were one thing. Any violent recrimination over the sudden death of John F. Kennedy could well have been monstrous. The pressures, the deep tragedy, and the popular unrest were all there. Even though the Warren Report itself really satisfies few serious scholars and investigators, it did serve to get this country through a trying time.

So, Prouty states clearly that he loved the country more than the truth about the killing of Kennedy. He states clearly that the Warren Report in concealing the truth of the Kennedy assassination served the country's interests. He states that a fraudulent report about the killing of a democratically elected President was a service to the state. He quite clearly in the Secret Team told us that the CIA and the Pentagon were involved in the killing of the President. But he saw the act of covering for their murder as a service to the country. Prouty saw the evil in the CIA and the Pentagon, but he approved of the Warren Commission covering their killing of the President. Fully recognizing the warts of the CIA and the Pentagon, he still approved of the Warren Commission covering for their removal of a democratically elected President by their cover action. That, I submit to you, Owen, is a form of love, love of the state and its institutions, which rises above love for democracy.

Should I quote for you where he stated the CIA and the Pentagon were involved? I will do so.

Two wise men, much experienced in the terrible pressures of government, Harry S. Truman and William O. Douglas, came up with similar conclusions, one after Kennedy's searing lesson at the Bay of Pigs and the other after his tragic death in Dallas. Both of them saw sinister intrigue and the extreme power of these two groups, the CIA and the Pentagon." Both saw the "various insidious influences of the CIA and the Pentagon, and both wondered as Douglas asked, "Can any President ever be strong enough really to rule?" (p. 420).

Marty and I don't claim to know more than others. On the contrary, we submit that the explanation of the assassination is very simple. We submit that Garrison understood it all. If you submit that Garrison changed his view expressed by him in *Heritage of Stone*, then please send me at my expense evidence to support that proposition.

I am not being defensive when I state as fact, that Garrison's hostile view of the warfare state was crystal clear, and that he put the assassination in a Cold War context. You say you agree with 90% of what Garrison wrote. Then kindly state that you believe the killing of JFK was for Cold War reasons and that the Pentagon and CIA were involved. Prouty said that in the quotes I gave you from his 1990 reissue of *The Secret Team*. Does he still hold to that view? Do you?

I am sure that you would have no problem with conceding this. The blurb on the back cover of 1990 reissue of *The Secret Team* states the following:

The Secret Team: The CIA and Its Allies in Control of he U.S. and the World pulls no punches exposing the CIA for what it is and what it really does. Based on cold, hard facts combined with historical hindsight, Prouty presents the CIA with an indictment–

guilty of manipulation and deception concerning people and government on both a domestic and international scope.

Under the iron-fisted will of Allen Dulles, the CIA secretly and gently moved into the "action" realms of espionage, including clandestine and overt operations that could be found all over the world–Cuba, Vietnam, Laos, Cambodia, Germany, Hungary... Its sensors are found in every corner of the globe, continually gathering information under the guise of "anti-communism" and "advisory personnel."

Maturity brought with it a determination to survive while being completely self-sufficient, thus the Secret Team was born–a brain trust of military men, scientists, educators, business dynamos, intellectuals, economists... This elite group has no restrictive chains on it whatsoever; nothing is impossible, anything can happen...and it usually does:

Running organizations; spying on our own government; infiltrating military/police forces of friendly allies; hit-and-run tactics; development of "super snooping" devices; all this plus...and all shrouded in a cloak of secrecy.

This Secret Team explodes all of the intricacies, secrets, operations, and organizations that combine in a complex network whose core is the CIA.

But when Prouty joined our Committee of Correspondence he contended that the CIA was not behind the killing of Kennedy. He never answered my letter in which I laid out the evidence for the proposition that he arrived at in his *Secret Team*, evidence that the CIA as an institution killed Kennedy. If the CIA was the "core" of the Secret Team, then how can Prouty say that the Secret Team killed Kennedy but the CIA was not responsible for the killing? You see my difficulty with Prouty, Owen?

Prouty in the *Secret Team*, contrary to what Marty says, did put the killing in a Cold War context. He speaks of the Secret Team which has as its core the CIA on page 425 as:

It will do anything in the name of anti-Communism. Yet in its greatest anti-Communist war it sees no inconsistency in the killing of one of its most anti-Communist creations–Ngo Dinh Diem. In its zeal to rid the Caribbean of Communism, it leaps at the chance to rid the Dominican Republic of Latin American's strongest non-Communist, Rafael Trujillo.

Garrison said that clearly in the quotes I provided for you; it was central to Garrison's concept. How can you say you agree with 90% of what Garrison said, and yet the Cold War thesis of Garrison "means nothing to you?" Please explain.

You say that "Salandria says it was the warfare state." Owen, I have proven to you that Garrison said it was the warfare state.

You ask, "What does warfare state mean anyway?" Please read Fred J. Cook's *The Warfare State*. Buy it, and charge me for it.

You state: "Fletcher said he used to go out with you and Fensterwald for lunch often. You know the man." Owen, I never met Fletcher Prouty. I met Fensterwald once. That was quite enough. He reeked of CIA.

Owen, I am not calling you names. I just cannot reconcile Prouty putting his name as author of a book which describes the Secret Team as having as its core the CIA, and which does CIA business, and then his telling us that the CIA and Allen Dulles were not involved in the killing of Kennedy but the Secret Team was.

Let us continue with our civil discourse. Just because I disagree with you and John Thomas does not mean that I don't think you are guys from whom I can learn by contrasting my thinking with yours.

MM (2/17/2000)

I spent some time yesterday listening to the Prouty audios, in one of which Fletch says what he later said to us in the correspondence and seems to be his final judgment– that neither the CIA nor the FBI nor the Pentagon was involved per se, as institutions, in the assassination or the cover-up.

This is precisely the point that I questioned him on at the end of our correspondence, and the one I believe where he thought I was going astray. But we never talked it out. Now we are doing that, thanks to Vince, and I think it is a good thing.

We do not have to come to any conclusions about the motivations of John, Owen, or Fletch in adopting this point of view. John's expositions have made it clear what the basic assumption is that justifies their point of view: the need for an intelligence establishment. I'm sure that Fletch shares this assumption. Don't know about Owen.

No one argues with John's second assumption–that the intelligence establishment empowers the Secret Team.

And there can be no argument about the conclusion, once these two assumptions or propositions are accepted: the Secret Team is "necessary to maintain liberty."

That, Gentlemen, is the end of the story. John, Owen, and Fletch can spend the rest of their days rummaging around in this shit bag to find a few more names to add to the ST roster. I have no desire to do this, because it is a completely hopeless endeavor. The identity of the ST will keep "assassination researchers" intrigued and busy for decades, but I agree with Marty and Vince that it only serves to perpetuate the cover-up and the state of denial.

The same is true of the search for truth about the origin of AIDS, and all other mysteries that are not mysteries of life or of science but simply artifacts of the national security state.

The only trouble with this point of view is that it leaves us with nowhere to go, and no work to do.

I am also (still) intrigued by the transparency idea. But that too is an insoluble mystery, and I don't think it is something I want to keep in my head either. What for? There is not the slightest possibility of confirming it.

Remove the mysteries, and what do you have?

That is why I said at the beginning that we are in essence a support group, or should be.

VS (2/17/2000)

Mike, I would contend that the loss of mystery is not to be lamented. It is this loss which opens us up to much gain. Through our clear prism of understanding of the institutional killing of Kennedy we are able to see with greater clarity the workings of power in our society. Therefore, we are subjected to less shock as events unfold and are better prepared to deal with the horrors. For example, I knew that Robert Kennedy was going to be killed in California. I knew that Vietnam would be a horror. I knew that we would not have any peaceful settlement which would have avoided the Gulf War and Kosovo. By seeing our society with the clarity that an understanding of the Kennedy killing affords us, we gain insight which insulates us from being trapped into having our

thought processes paralyzed. We thereby become less compelled by Orwellian techniques to love and to become thoughtless subjects of Big Brother.

There is plenty to do in terms of healthy social action. In my judgment, social action based on the truth of the Kennedy killing is quixotic. As I have said previously, I don't feel that our society has the political readiness to use the Kennedy assassination as a fulcrum for progressive social action. But I feel that it can help you choose to involve yourself more wisely in social actions which do not serve Big Brother.

Please allow me to explain how I have been helped in my choice of political work by my understanding of the JFK killing. Very early following the issuance of the Warren Report, Allen Dulles spoke in California before an audience with included David Lifton. Lifton reported that Dulles challenged the people in the audience that, if they did not believe the Warren Report then they should name the names of the people who killed Kennedy. When I appeared on TV programs in Philadelphia, I would be asked to name names. But my view of an institutional national security state killing caused me to have no interest whatever in naming operatives.

Josiah Thompson tried to get me interested in Igor Bouganov as a killer. I lost interest in a rush. I realized that the mechanics were of no importance. The warfare state had countless names of operatives stored in its computers who would direct and execute killings. I had enough information that caused me to conclude that the assassination had the support of the national security state and its civilian allies. Therefore, the names of the operatives were not of any interest to me.

I told you how Lulu Bell Holmes, an important and acknowledged FBI agent came to me as Rita Rollins and offered me $12,000.00 to interview in Canada persons who would provide names for me. Because I had an institutional view of the killing, I was able to tell her to go back to her agency, which I identified for her as CIA, and tell the Agency that I knew that the Agency had killed Kennedy.

Now, more recently, we have been asked to name the names of the Secret Team. I have refused to join this noble effort to make our society more open by hunting for names of persons who are members of this Secret Team. The warfare aspects of our government had already demonstrated for me that it and its civilian allies were willing to commit crimes to obstruct justice in covering for Kennedy's murderers. I named those criminals in my November, 1998 speech in Dallas. No libel suits have been filed against me to date.

Try naming members of the Secret Team. We are told by Prouty that Dulles was instrumental in setting up the Secret Team. We are told by Prouty that Lansdale was key. Prouty told us that the CIA was its source. Prouty told us that it was larger and more powerful than the CIA. Prouty told us that it had its tentacles in the Pentagon. Prouty told us that the Secret Team used the CIA. And finally, Prouty told us that Dulles, Lansdale, the CIA and the Pentagon were not involved in killing Kennedy. Well, given the fact that Prouty was describing something that was most complex and inexplicable, I chose not to use up my time hunting up Secret Team members. I chose, instead, to stick with the simple model of explanation which has served me so well and for which I have ample supporting data. I stuck with the simple explanation that the CIA killed Kennedy for Cold War reasons, and the killing was fraudulently and criminally concealed by the Warren Report and the U.S. media.

I have looked around for better social causes than Secret Team mystery work. I thought I found such a cause. I discovered a small group which had seven Nobel Laureates on its Board of Directors. It was headed up by a professor who was the son of one of our country's leading economists. The professor paid a lot of attention to me and spoke knowingly of the Kennedy assassination. I was prepared to give the group several thousand dollars a year. But one thing bothered me. The leader of it told Marty Schotz that he had to trust John Newman.

I told the professor that this support of Newman troubled me. He asked me to provide information to him which caused me to distrust Newman. I said that I would report the information directly to Newman. I asked him, since he knew Newman, to provide me with the opportunity to communicate with Newman directly. Suddenly, the professor informed me that he was too busy to correspond with me anymore. He was apparently not interested in my money.

Why do I think Newman is so important? Because both he and Prouty have stated that the CIA did not kill Kennedy. Because he like Prouty takes the view that we cannot as citizens come to any conclusions about the Kennedy assassination until we receive signals from them, two former intelligence operatives, of what we are free to know about the assassination.

Newman tells us on pages 429-430 of *Oswald and the CIA* that he cannot solve the Dealey Plaza Puzzle because:

The author lacks the requisite skills in ballistics, forensic pathology, photo and imagery interpretation, and criminal psychology, to name but a few. We need fewer studies that claim to have all the answer and more that focus on specific areas and are built on firm but evidentiary foundations.

What foundations? Oh, he explains:

...we have yet to find documentary evidence for an institutional plot in the CIA to murder the president. The facts do not compel such a conclusion If there had been such a plot, many of the documents we are reading–such as the CIA cables to Mexico City, the FBI, State and Navy–would never had been created. However, the facts may well fit into other scenarios, such as the "renegade faction" hypothesis.

So, he like Prouty, exonerates the national security state. So he, like Prouty, says that before you can prove a case against any government institution you must await word from the insiders and not rely on your own reasoning abilities.

This post was just interrupted by a call from Congressman Joseph Hoeffel. He thanked me for my money support in his last campaign. I supported him because he got a high score from Peace Action, a coalition of peace groups of which I am a Board advisor. I told him that I would not support him this time around, because I was disappointed in his voting for the anti-missile system. He said that he never accepted the concept of a SDI missile shield for the country, but that this limited shield he thought was necessary if it worked, to protect us against the possibility of a rogue-state attack.

I responded by saying that there is no evidence that it will work. I said that I felt it was being produced to provide profit for the military-industrial complex. I told him that I did not accept the concept of a rogue state. I said that I believed this was an invention of our Pentagon to fatten up its budget and to take money away from the poor. I told him that I wanted him to vote for less money for the Pentagon and more money for the poor. I told him that I felt he should vote to tax me more.

He told me that he agreed with much of what I said, but that if the scientists who say that the system will work are correct, he is for its deployment to protect us against the possibility of a madman at the head of a rogue state sending a missile against us and killing several hundred thousand U.S. citizens. He mentioned North Korea as developing a long-range missile.

I reminded him that the North Korean people were starving. I told him that nations are not in the normal course lead by insane people. I said that the possibility of a mad head of state committing suicide for himself and his people by directing such an attack is so remote that it should not command dollars so much needed by the poor. I told him that we must deal with probabilities and not possibilities in making decisions on how our resources are spent. I concluded by stating that the deployment of such a system would violate a treaty we have with Russia.

I told him that when and if he changed his mind on the anti-missile system he could count on several thousands of dollars of support from me. He said he would consider the matter on its merits, and not because of the offer of money, but because of the merits, he might change his mind. He thanked me for my candor. Mike, this is close to verbatim of what we discussed. Do you recognize any of the thought processes which we have been using in our discussion?

There is much to do to improve our society. I believe that what we are doing in our committee of correspondence is making us into better citizens. The clearing away of the mystery is the clearing away of mental fog. I feel truly privileged to be able to have our exchanges which are considered by some of us to be mind-numbing.

MM (2/18/2000)

Vince, your letter is a strong tonic. Thank you. You are a positive force. But this is nothing new. You have always been a positive force. Your description of the dynamics and purpose (and yes, accomplishments) of the group is exactly on target, in my opinion.

It is very interesting to hear about your search for meaningful alliances. This is what I have been doing, too, at least since 1988, when I saw the Turner film. Maybe that is what we are all doing. Nobody wants to be alone. I'm talking about intellectual isolation, of course, not physical or emotional isolation, which is worse.

I see now why you think Newman is more than a fly to be swatted. Black helicopter is more like it.

Vince, the fact that your search has ended up with this small circle of people, and not with a group of famous professors and Nobel laureates, is a tremendous encouragement and confirmation that we are on the right road. Nobody has been wasting his time. This is the microcosm. I too feel privileged to have been part of it.

Did I say "ended"? No. Vince, I take your word for it that there are no organizations out there, amongst the thousands advocating various worthy causes, that represent your (our) point of view accurately. I believe you have tried harder than I have to find them, and have been doing it longer, so if you haven't found them I don't believe I will either.

Now, so far I have been a failure at getting anything started (though I haven't given up completely on the petition idea–Zeke is still working on it), but I would like to make another suggestion. Let us institutionalize ourselves. Let's think up a nice name (Institute for Peace, Inst. Against Thought Control, etc.) and simply become it. We want to be part of something, let's be it, the Institute of US. Maybe we could even have

seminars and such. Not quite at the level of Nobel laureates–but who knows? I won't suggest it calling the Salandria Institute because I know you will reject it (though I think that would be a good name), but it is clear that for such a thing to succeed, it will have to have your and Marty's full support. Your last letter would make a perfect charter for this institute.

Am I racing toward another windmill?

MM (2/19/2000)

How about "Institute for Political Demystification"?

Demystification target, or Myth No. 1:

The intelligence establishment is necessary to maintain freedom.

This myth leads directly to the conclusion that freedom is slavery (since the intelligence establishment empowers our masters).

Why hasn't somebody tried to argue with me that I should not know the codes for launching nuclear missiles?

They would win that argument, but that to me does not justify the existence of intelligence agencies. I don't deny that we need a police force, either, or an army, or that there are other things besides missile launching codes that need to be kept secret. But as I've said, add these things up and I think they would amount to a tiny fraction of the secrets that are now kept.

I guess everybody agrees with me. So, men, our mission is clear: the intelligence establishment, the United National Security States of America, must be destroyed, so that the United States of America can live again. This is our patriotic duty, our duty to our country and our countrymen. God bless America, and down with CIA, NSA, DIA, etc. Get those rats and their rathouses out of our house.

Prouty's work is valuable: he has shown us a lot about how the rats work. But Vince is correct: Prouty's conclusion is identical with Newman's: the intelligence establishment is ok. It is necessary to maintain liberty. Get rid of (some of) the rats, but keep the rathouses. Freedom is slavery.

MM (2/20/2000)

Further targets for demystification (in random order):

We do not know who killed JFK or why.

We do not know who killed MLK or why.

We do not know who killed RFK or why.

We do not know who killed Alfred Herrhausen or why.

We do not know if the US military used poison gas in Vietnam.

We do not know if the US military hunted down and killed deserters in Vietnam.

We do not know what caused the downing of TWA 800.

We do not know how AIDS originated.

We do not know if LHO was a CIA agent.

We do not know if the Chinese embassy in Belgrade was bombed on purpose.

We do not know who controls the US government (pending identification of the ever elusive Secret Team, and beyond that, the unknowable High Cabal).

Making the list, I see that most of these myths are expressions of ignorance. (Ignorance is Knowledge.) When they take the form of assertions, they are simply lies (Lies are Truth):

LHO killed JFK, Ray killed MLK, Sirhan killed RFK, the RAF killed Herrhausen, etc.

JFK made no radical change in Vietnam policy just before he was killed, and neither did Johnson.

The US is a democratic country, run by and for the people.

The American press is free and morally responsible, the watchdog of liberty.

Only Congress can declare war (a constitutional myth).

The US government must account for the money it collects and spends (constitutional myth).

The US government has no political prisoners.

The US government is not a conspiracy. It does not conspire to murder.

The US government does not develop and deploy biological weapons.

The US government does not conduct radiation experiments on American citizens without their knowledge.

The fall of the Soviet Union and the Eastern bloc was a popular revolution.

The president of the US is the head of state.

The US government is well intentioned. The six million people it has killed since 1945 (by John Stockwell's estimate), directly or indirectly, including 58,000 Americans in Vietnam, were the tragic results of good intentions.

JFK fucked up the Bay of Pigs.

Allen Dulles could not wipe the ear-to-ear grin off his face, being interviewed by reporters after Dallas and explaining that he could not answer one question because that question would lead to more questions, because he was a happy person by nature, even in the face of a national tragedy.

The US has free elections. Anyone can be elected to public office.

The US is the greatest country in the world (everyman's myth), the freest country in the world (Chomskyan myth), etc.

Americans must identify themselves with the US government. If the government is not good, Americans cannot be good. If the government is good, we are good. If we are good, the government is good.

All is well. Get rid of the rats and all is right with the world, because all is right with the United National Security States of America.

Etc.

VS (2/23/2000)

Mike, I have insisted, and I truly believe, that my thinking and my writings about the assassination are pedestrian and self-evident stuff. With respect to your thoughts of an institute, I feel that the thinking that you are capable of, can merit an institutional structure. But, please, Mike, understand that this old Italian peasant would not be comfortable being anywhere in the center of such an endeavor. I will try to help you in such efforts, but only if it is understood that I am not in any way an inspiration for the work which you contemplate.

VS (2/23/2000)

Joe, this is in reply to your inquiry about social action regarding the Kennedy assassination. Yes, Marty and I have concluded that the U.S. population is not ready for the truth about the Kennedy killing.

Please understand that we have already tested the waters. When the Warren Report was issued, I almost immediately began to address audiences regarding how obviously fraudulent the Warren Report was. Marty came with me to some of those talks. I spoke to many audiences. I spoke before Rotary Clubs, Young Republican Clubs, the Philadelphia Dental Society, Swarthmore College, St. Joseph's University, Philadelphia Sane, The Women's International League for Peace and Freedom, in Central Park, N.Y., to Jewish organizations, charitable organizations, on the radio and on TV.

I was with these audiences, as John Thomas describes me, "extraordinarily naive." *Naive* is defined in my dictionary as "unaffectedly or, sometimes, foolishly simple; childlike; artless; unsophisticated." I never, never received any hostility when I told the audiences simply, childlike, artlessly and in an unsophisticated fashion that our warfare state killed Kennedy. No one ever took me on, like John Thomas has. They questioned politely. They praised me for having great courage. They gave me awards. In short, they graciously accepted what I had to say.

At that time I practiced law. No client ever withdrew from me. Judges treated me with more respect than that to which I was entitled. I also then taught in high school. I came into the school on Monday, November 25, 1963 and advised my classes that it appeared that the CIA had killed Kennedy. I then taught this model of the assassination to all of my social studies high school classes until I left teaching in 1967. One student took issue with me. He walked out of my class. Later, when he was attending a local university, he came to my office and apologized to me for walking out of my class.

Oh, some teachers complained about my teaching. But the principal apparently admired it. The day I was leaving teaching, thinking that I was making life finally bearable for that good man, the principal came by to see me. He begged me to remain as a teacher. He told me how valuable he thought I was for the students. So one student's opposition which was later retracted, a few teachers who were in opposition to my expressions, and John Thomas's and Owen Rogers's complaints about me are the sum and substance of the criticism I received for teaching people over the years that U.S. intelligence killed Kennedy in the interests of our warfare state. If any of you in the group wish to enlist your support for that opposition, I would much appreciate your coming forward and doing so. John Thomas thinks there are some of you out there. I think in fairness to him, should you exist, you should announce yourselves.

But I was never able to offer any program to any of the groups whom I addressed other than to the students. I warned them to stay out of Vietnam, because our invasion was morally wrong and there would be a horrible escalation there. But for my naive thinking a lot more of my great working-class students would have been killed in Vietnam. Some of my former students came to me years after I left teaching and told me that I had saved their lives.

When I went to Dallas in November of 1998 and expressed the same thoughts to that audience, all of the audience, including the agents, gave me a standing ovation. No one criticized my speech. As I have demonstrated to you, John Thomas put into writing his admiration for the speech.

So, I don't agree with Marty that people are generally in denial. From my experience I found that people in our country, like foreign people with whom I have talked, all know at some level that the national security state killed Kennedy for Cold War purposes. For people like Owen Rogers, I simply put questions to them which go

inadequately answered or go unanswered, as do my questions to John Thomas. That tells me that they also know at some level that there are no adequate answers to the questions which point to the complicity of our national security state in the killing of Kennedy.

What is lacking is a societal movement which will provide a mechanism with which the enormous power of the national security state can be successfully addressed on this and its myriad related crimes. Our society enjoys great benefits from our super-power status. We learn to accept these privileges and then begin to incorporate them into the rhythm of our lives. Before we know it we view these privileges as though they are as vital to us as the air we breathe and the blood which courses through our veins.

Therefore, I believe that we will only be willing to dismantle the national security state when the empire which it protects costs us so much in terms of lives and resources that we are willing to surrender its largesse. Then we will see the necessity of relinquishing the privileges of empire and feel the need to confront the criminal aspects of our national security state. Until this time, I feel that social action based on what we know about the killing of Kennedy is futile. To organize social action around such a theme I believe is a losing cause. If you can organize a mass movement around people who have penchants for losing causes, then go to it. In our group presently there are 11 persons, at least 2 of whom have already opted out. Such a tiny first step! Such long odds against defeating so powerful an enemy are to me most daunting.

For me, employing our naive knowledge to understand better how power works in our society, and making this quasi-public record which may survive us and may help guide people in different, perhaps distant, and more fruitful times is the better course.

VS (2/23/2000)

Owen, I have never claimed to have done as much for our country as Fletcher did. I have never claimed to have done anything for our country. I believe that I have done something in stating the simple and self-evident truth about the Kennedy assassination.

You state: "Fletcher is still alive and he can speak for himself." Well, Owen, before you came into the group I put to Fletcher the untenability of his assertion that the CIA did not kill Kennedy. I put to him a number of proofs that the Agency did kill Kennedy. He never answered my letter.

Fletcher will tell you that I have never shown him any discourtesy. I never said that he is a U.S. intelligence agent at this time. I have taken sharp issue with his statement that the CIA did not kill Kennedy. But I have not done so except by making arguments which he has not chosen to refute.

If that represents putting Fletcher down, then I plead guilty to this. I plead guilty to putting down Fletcher Prouty just as I have the other critics who were ex intelligence officers and who now state that the CIA did not kill Kennedy. They are, as you know, Bill Boxley, Bill Turner, and John Newman.

I plead guilty to taking sharp issue with John Thomas, you, Owen, and any other critic who would seek to strip the Kennedy assassination from its Cold War national security state institutional context.

MM (2/25/2000)

Have you considered, Owen, that Fletch himself may not be fully aware of how his theory exonerates the CIA, or of how dangerous this is? As I've said, if you accept John's Proposition No. 1, that the intelligence establishment is necessary to maintain liberty, you would not see the danger. Simple as that.

From what you say, the subtitle of Fletch's first book should be "The ST in control of the CIA, the US, and the world." And above the ST we have the High Cabal. (Consisting of T.V. Soong, Averell Harriman, and others unknown–these are the only two examples I remember Fletch ever offering.)

In a previous post you compared the ST/HC with a shark and the CIA with a coral reef. Now you are comparing the ST/HC with (presumably human) elephant drivers and the CIA with an elephant.

I told you what I thought of the coral reef analogy, but you did not respond. This new one is false for the same reason. But you have added an interesting new twist.

We are all familiar with the term "rogue elephant"–Frank Church's expression to refer to the CIA gone awry. Now, we could well examine the appropriateness of that analogy, too, since rogue elephants are understood to be basically good and useful creatures that sometimes go on a rampage; it's in the nature of the beast. We could talk about how that analogy applies to the CIA. Is the CIA such a good and useful animal that we are willing to put up with its rampages? Let's do what I have suggested: list all the accomplishments of the CIA, and all its rampages, and see how they balance out. Does it balance out to a decision that the animal is worth keeping? If not, shoot the beast.

But the interesting twist that you have added is that it is not the rogue nature of the elephant we have to contend with, but his evil human drivers, way on high! The High Cabal! You have now put the CIA at a third remove from culpability! The good elephant, the CIA, is not at the mercy of its own rogue nature (or not only), but at the mercy of its drivers–members of a different and superior (so we think) species! And what is to stop us from seeing an even Higher Cabal above them–Martians, say?

I urge you, Owen, to ask yourself this question: What are you fighting for? I think you are all fighting for the same thing–you, John, Fletch, Newman, and probably Chomsky. But do you need the CIA that much? Do you need it at all? Does anybody need it? Does Fletch need it? Is whatever good it does in any proportion to the horrors it has perpetrated? I am talking here about horrors perpetrated, and generally accepted as perpetrated, by the CIA as an institution, as the CIA, and not as any sort of Secret Team or High Cabal. These horrors are fully documented.

If your answer is yes, you do want and need the CIA that much, then I can see why you are willing to accept any attempt to disguise their guilt. How else can you describe all the mysterious innuendoes you are substituting for what is a stark and well-documented fact: that the CIA is a monster. The institution of the CIA is a monster. That is a fact. You want to substitute the mysterious ST and the mysterious HC for that fact. Why? Because you want that fact to remain a fact. You want and need the CIA. You are simply creating a permanently elusive scapegoat in order to accommodate this fact you insist on keeping. It can't be bad, since you want to keep it, and therefore the bad guys are in the ST or the HC.

But consider not accepting this fact that the CIA is necessary. If this is not a fact, you have no reason, no reason at all, to defend the CIA or try to keep it from being destroyed. Is that correct, or not?

So think about it again. What are you defending? The CIA. Why? Because we need it. Why? Because...

Please complete the sentence! I'd like to have Fletch complete it. This is the basis of our whole argument here.

Let's put it this way: Is the CIA an elephant, or a raptor?

MM (2/26/2000)

Owen, you and Prouty say the Gold Key Club, the Secret Team, and the High Cabal hold real power over the DOD, the CIA, and all the other important government agencies. But what is the source of this power? Remember John Thomas's second proposition, which no one (so far) has argued with: The intelligence establishment empowers the ST (et al.). The source of this secret power structure is the intelligence establishment itself. You say the ST et al. have power over the intelligence establishment. But the intelligence establishment empowers them, i.e. makes it possible for them to turn the tables, so to speak, and control the institutions that empower them.

Here's an analogy: There's a good ship's captain who empowers his first mate to do whatever he likes. The first mate then proceeds to murder and terrorize the crew, point the ship in the wrong direction, make war with other ships, etc., all bad stuff that the captain wouldn't do, but the captain can't do anything about it because he has given the first mate all these powers.

Now, we can argue about whether the captain is really "good" or not. I say he is not good, but bad, and if you want to get into that argument, I am sure I will win it. But the fact is that it makes no difference, because the captain empowers the bad guy, the first mate. Therefore, there can only be one reasonable conclusion: The captain has to go, because that is the only way to get rid of the first mate.

What bothers me about Fletch is that he avoids this conclusion. I can agree with everything else he says. He has a fascinating fund of information about that first mate and his machinations. But at the end of that, you have to face the logical consequences. If the first mate is bad and we want to get rid of him (which all of us agree on), then we have to get rid of the captain.

This is a question for information, not an argument: Where does Prouty say the CIA and the intelligence establishment, the Secret Government (as Bill Moyers called it), should be abolished? I don't think he says that anywhere, because he doesn't believe it.

John Thomas doesn't believe this either. He believes the intelligence establishment is necessary to maintain liberty. That is why I put him and Fletch in the same boat. And that is why, ironically but true if you are willing to think about it, they are in the same boat with Newman (and I think Chomsky). John doesn't mind being in the same boat with Newman, but Fletch does. I know what he thinks of Newman and Chomsky. What I am saying is that despite these differences, on the one final, crucial point–do we need the intelligence establishment or not–they all agree. They all say yes. (You'd have to work to get Chomsky to say it, but I'm betting he would eventually.)

What we are calling the intelligence establishment, or the national security state and its various agencies have nothing to do with the land of the free and the home of the brave. I am saying that they should all be abolished. Do you agree with that? Does Fletch? Apparently not, although all of Fletch's writings, including his letters to me, support the obvious conclusion that the intelligence establishment must be disestablished. That is the only way to get rid of the ST, HC, Gold Key Club, etc.

But when Fletch then says, as he has on occasion, that the CIA, FBI etc. "didn't do it," what purpose can that possibly serve, if not to exonerate those agencies and preserve them? Why doesn't he say, with me, that they should be abolished?

Nobody is saying the CIA is the only guilty party. I have always said that the CIA is just a cover term for the intelligence establishment, the national security state, or the secret government, whatever you want to call it. Secrecy is the culprit, in a word. But we can start with the CIA, since it obviously (and by law) plays a central role. Get rid of it. Then get rid of all the rest of them.

Now we get to another crucial point. Since secrecy has pervaded all of government (and society?), does that mean we have to get rid of the entire government and society? No. That would be throwing out the baby with the bath water. Just get rid of the intelligence establishment. If that doesn't do it, ok, then there's nothing left but revolution. But I think that would do it. What do you think?

You make the mistake of generalizing from the intelligence establishment to the DOD, State Dept., etc. Of course they are infiltrated, and to the extent that they maintain secrecy, they should be reformed. But the intelligence agencies are by charter secret organizations (unlike the DOD and the State Dept.), and they are what should be eliminated. I believe this would eliminate the secrecy that has pervaded the rest of the government and society.

The purpose of government agencies should be not to maintain secrecy, but to eliminate it. Instead of the CIA we should have a Central Transparency Agency, which has no secrets at all and whose purpose is to expose all the secrets maintained by anyone, government or non-government, that have public consequences.

I have not missed your point at all, but I think you are missing mine. Ok, the bad guys are financed by mysterious bankers. Could this be the case if the bad guys were not empowered and disguised by the intelligence establishment? Does the intelligence establishment expose them or does it make it possible for them to thrive?

The creation of the CIA and the intelligence establishment was unconstitutional, un-American, and evil. It doesn't matter what the documents say. We know what the CIA has done, overtly and covertly, since WW 2. Read William Blum, *Killing Hope*. Then go back and answer my question again: Where are all the "good" things to make up for all this evil?

You ask who gives the orders. We are not going to find out who gives the orders, who is on the ST, who is in the HC, who is in the Gold Key Club, who the bankers are, etc., no matter how much research we do or how many Fletch Proutys there are to give us tantalizing hints. Why not? Because their anonymity is protected by the CIA et al., the intelligence establishment.

If you want to know who the big guys are, you will have to get rid of the intelligence establishment. In order to do that, you will have to confront the question I have asked: Why do we need spooks?

You ask if the CIA killed Herrhausen, and I say, quite possibly. Or the BND or any combination of German and American intelligence operatives. As Wisnewski shows clearly, he could not have been killed, and more importantly, killed "mysteriously" and with total impunity, without the cooperation of the intelligence establishment.

Re the goal of naming names, it is hopeless. What we need to do is stop counting the trees and look at the forest. Get rid of the intelligence establishment.

When I said some people "need" the CIA, I was simply trying to verbalize what I think is going on in your mind, in order to help you see it more clearly yourself. If you do not need the CIA, fine. We agree. We can get rid of the CIA and the entire intelligence

establishment. Can we agree on that? If so, we are arguing about nothing at all. Would Fletch agree?

You now suggest the metaphor of a wolf in sheep's clothing. Are we now talking about the intelligence establishment, not as a coral reef, or an elephant, but a wolf disguised as a sheep? Ok, I can accept that analogy–although I have nothing against wolves. But taking the expression as you mean it, I agree. A wolf in sheep's clothing. What do we do with a wolf in sheep's clothing? What do we do with that animal that appears to be a sheep but is really a wolf? We shoot the mother fucker. Am I correct?

Owen, I don't want to argue for argument's sake. As I've said, I respect Prouty very much, and I think his work is very valuable. He has been a very important influence on my life, just as he has been on yours. I am trying to use all the information and insights he has given me to go beyond him. I am focusing on the final conclusion that can be drawn, and must be drawn, from his work. That conclusion is not that we must spend our time ferreting out the ST, but face the factual and logical conclusion that the intelligence establishment itself is what must be disestablished. I'm sorry he cannot participate in this discussion, because I think I could eventually convince him that this is the only reasonable conclusion to come to.

If you are in contact with Fletch, please tell him that I have concluded from his enormously valuable contribution that the intelligence establishment must be abolished. Ask him if he would agree to that, and if not, why not.

Best regards to you and to Canada, a fine country that certainly must have its problems and intelligence establishment, too, but at least they offered refuge to draft dodging patriots like myself who had nowhere else to turn but jail, when my own government was busy committing genocide against the people of Southeast Asia and also against its own citizens.

VS (2/24/2000)

This is to add to Marty's comments re John Thomas's excerpt from Chapter 2, Part 1 of the Ratcliffe site "Understanding Special Operations."

Prouty says: "AIDS is a weapon and don't forget it." AIDS, Prouty says, is our weapon developed by the Defense Department, but he does not condemn it or the institution that created it. He then says: "This is why people don't know how to assimilate the idea of warfare." But he does not condemn warfare. He does not condemn our institutions which by mission and structure are designed to produce and use these weapons. "This is why people don't know how to assimilate the idea of warfare. They don't know what to do with hydrogen bombs that can erase a whole city in seconds." He does not propose the only thing to do with hydrogen bombs is to eliminate them as crimes against humanity. He does not take issue with our national security state for having created the hydrogen bomb, stockpiled it, and produced delivery systems which can carry and deliver more than one such bomb to destroy more than one city.

Prouty then goes on to say: "That's the basic problem we're having today when we talk about warfare. We have forgotten how war is waged and defense is not the way to wage a war." The only inference one can draw from this statement is that our national security state must be prepared to fight war offensively, and the hydrogen bomb and AIDS are fair weapons, because all is fair in love and war.

Prouty discloses that Al Haig, Joseph Califano and Richard Secord were all CIA operatives serving undercover in DOD in 1962. Now, if Schotz or Salandria had come up

with such a statement without having sourced it, John Thomas would have joyfully pounced. If Prouty's statement about these three men is true, then what does it demonstrate other than that the CIA had enormous power in 1962? That same CIA was designated and defined in the very title of *The Secret Team*: "The Secret Team–The CIA and its Allies in Control of the United States and the World." If that CIA could employ covertly those three men and could create the Secret Team and could control the whole world, why was it not probable that the CIA in accordance with its mission and structure killed the President? The President, after all, was part of the whole world until the CIA shot him out of it.

Owen, you say that the term Cold War national security state institutional structure is too vague. Why? It is specifically defined and legislated by our federal government. The Secret Team was never legislated. Although I read *The Secret Team* I came away with what is on the back cover of the 1990 reissue:

...thus the Secret Team was born–a brain trust of military men, scientists, educators, business dynamos, intellectuals, economists... This elite group has no restrictive chains on it whatsoever, nothing is impossible, anything can happen...and it usually does: Running organizations; spying on our own government; infiltrating military/police forces of friendly allies; hit-and-run tactics; development of "super snooping" devices; all this plus...and all shrouded in a cloak of secrecy. The "Secret Team" explodes all of the intricacies, secrets, operations, and organizations that combine in a complex network whose core is the CIA.

I cannot understand what is vague about the term "national security state," which is precisely defined in our law. I cannot understand how you can describe as precise the definition of the Secret Team. But Prouty and I do agree that the Secret Team's "core is the CIA." And that is all that we have to agree upon in order to conclude that the CIA was at the core of the killing of President Kennedy. Aristotle and Morrissey tell us this through the use of syllogistic logic. But unfortunately at this logical juncture, Prouty parts company with me. By what system of logic does he accomplish this escape act? Owen, my mind is too naive to fathom the logical path followed by Prouty in concluding, notwithstanding what I have set forth above, that the CIA was not at the core of the killing of Kennedy.

Then, Owen, you go on to point out in your post that "The Army, Navy, etc. all had their own black intelligence." Right! And all this was legislated into existence by the national security state legislation in order to fight the Cold War and to defend our empire. You and I, although you do not choose to admit it, have just agreed, using Prouty's definitions, that the national security state is the only logical killing institutional force behind the assassination of JFK.

Owen, keep circulating Jim Garrison's lectures. This is a public service. Please advise me when you come across in those lectures Jim Garrison stating that the Secret Team and not the CIA killed Kennedy.

VS (3/3/2000)

Mike, I did say that John Thomas's position that the national security state was not institutionally involved in the assassination of JFK causes him to be, albeit unwittingly, aiding the assassins. I do not hate him for this. I do not even dislike him for this. I continue to love him for the assistance he has provided me in terms of helping my thinking on this subject. I apologize for causing him pain by stating this belief of mine.

But I cannot in good conscience retract the statement, because I honestly believe it. Furthermore, I believe this would be true of anyone who does not accept this point of view. I recognize that perhaps hundreds of millions of Americans share John Thomas's view. I understand how unpopular this view is, and how difficult it is for U.S. citizens to accept it. I do not hate any U.S. citizen for refusing to accept my view of the JFK killing.

In my Dallas speech in November of 1998, I put the matter more strongly. I urged that for any one to examine and to understand the historical evidence and not to see the institutional involvement of the national security state in the killing of Kennedy involved that person in the criminality of being an accessory after the fact to the murder. John read that speech months before it was published. He was invited to criticize it. Instead of offering any criticism he chose to praise it in writing.

Now, I have asked John to explain what caused him to change his view of my work on the assassination and his opinion of me. Because until lately he has lavished praise on me. Read Kelin's anthology of all of my writings. From the beginning to the Dallas speech you will see that I never equivocated on nor changed my conviction that the national security state had killed Kennedy. Then I have been curious as to why has John chosen of late to take such a dim view of my work on the assassination and on my character and convictions? John has declined to answer that and many other questions which I have put to him. Are any of you interested in what caused the turn? If so, will you please put these questions to him so that he may answer you.

One of the things which I did during my week Sabbatical from this group, was to reread Erich Fromm's *The Art of Loving* (New York: Bantam, 1956). Fromm has had more influence on me than any other writer. He is more important to me than George Orwell.

Permit me to quote from this book. I feel that after reading these quotes you will perhaps be able to understand better what role I have tried to fulfill in my participation in this group's activities during the several years that we have been in existence. After reading these excerpts, maybe you will understand why I have employed "love" rather than "sincerely" before almost all of my signatures appended to the letters I have sent to you. Verbatim quotes from Erich Fromm follow:

Love is the only satisfactory answer to the problem of human existence (Pre-Foreword).

…Yet most of us are unable to develop our capacities for love on the only level that really counts–a love that is compounded of maturity, self-knowledge and courage (Ibid.).

…Learning to love, like other arts, demands practice and concentration. Even more than any other art it demands genuine insight and understanding (Ibid.).

…The reading of this book would be a disappointing experience for anyone who expects easy instruction in the art of loving. This book, on the contrary, wants to show that love is not a sentiment which can be easily indulged in by anyone, regardless of the level of maturity reached by him. It wants to convince the reader that all his attempts for love are bound to fail, unless he tries most actively to develop his total personality, so as to achieve a productive orientation; that satisfaction in individual love cannot be attained without the capacity to love one's neighbor, without true humility, courage, faith and discipline. In a culture in which these qualities are rare, the attainment of the capacity to

love must remain a rare achievement. Or–anyone can ask how many truly loving persons he has known (vii).

…In a primitive society the group is small; it consists of those with whom one shares blood and soil. With the growing development of culture, the group enlarges; it becomes the citizenry of a polis, the citizenry of a large state, the members of a church. Even the poor Roman felt pride because he could say "civis romanus sum"; Rome and the Empire were his family, his home, his world. Also in contemporary Western society the union with the group is the prevalent way of overcoming separateness. It is a union in which the individual self disappears to a large extent, and where the aim is to belong to the herd. If I am like everybody else, if I have no feelings or thoughts which make me different, if I conform in custom, dress, ideas, to the pattern of the group, I am saved; saved from the frightening experience of aloneness. The dictatorial systems use threats and terror to induce this conformity; the democratic countries, suggestion and propaganda. There is, indeed, one great difference between the two systems. In the democracies non-conformity is possible and, in fact, by no means entirely absent; in the totalitarian system, only a few unusual heroes and martyrs can be expected to refuse obedience. But in spite of this difference the democratic societies show an overwhelming degree of conformity. The reason lies in the fact that there has to be an answer to the quest for union, and if there is no other or better way, then the union of herd conformity becomes the predominant one. One can only understand the power of the fear to be different, the fear to be only a few steps away from the herd, if one understands the depths of the need not be separated. Sometimes this fear of non-conformity is rationalized as fear of practical dangers which could threaten the non-conformist. But actually, people want to conform to a much higher degree than they are forced to conform, at least in the Western democracies (pp. 10-11).

…The most important sphere of giving, however, is not that of material things, but lies in the specifically human realm. What does one person give to another? He gives of himself, of the most precious he has, he gives of his life. This does not necessarily mean that he sacrifices his life for the other–but that he gives him of that which is alive in him; he gives him of his job, of his interest, of his understanding, of his knowledge, of his humor, of his sadness–of all expressions and manifestations of that which is alive in him. In thus giving of his life, he enriches the other person, he enhances the other's sense of aliveness by enhancing his own sense of aliveness. He does not give in order to receive; giving is in itself exquisite joy (p. 20).

…The child takes something apart, breaks it up in order to know it; or it takes an animal apart; cruelly tears off the wings of a butterfly in order to know it, to force its secret. The cruelty itself is motivated by something deeper: the wish to know the secret of things and of life.

The other path to knowing "the secret" is love. Love is active penetration of the other person, in which my desire to know is stilled by union. In the act of fusion I know you, I know myself, I know everybody–and I "know" nothing. I know in the only way knowledge of that which is alive is possible for man–by experience of union–not by any knowledge our thought can give . Sadism is motivated by the wish to know the secret, yet I remain as ignorant as I was before. I have torn the other being apart limb from limb, yet all I have done is to destroy him. Love is the only way of knowledge, which in the act of union answers my quest. In the act of loving of giving myself, in the act of penetrating

the other person, I find myself, I discover myself. I discover us both. I discover man (p. 25-26).

…Infantile love follow the principle: "I love because I am loved." Mature love follows the principal: "I am loved because I love." Immature love says: "I love you because I need you." Mature loves says: "I need you because I love you" (p. 34).

…The discussion of the art of loving cannot be restricted to the personal realm of acquiring and developing those characteristics and attitudes which have been described in this chapter. It is inseparably connected with the social realm. If to love means to have a loving attitude toward everybody, if love is a character trait, it must necessarily exist in one's relationship not only with one's family and friends, but toward those with whom one is in contact through one's work, business, profession. There is no "division of labor" between love for one's own and love for strangers. On the contrary, the condition for the existence of the former is the existence of the latter. To take this insight seriously means indeed a rather drastic change to one's social relations from the customary ones. While a great deal of lip service is paid to the religious ideal of love of one's neighbor, our relations are actually determined, at their best, by the principal of fairness. Fairness meaning not to use fraud and trickery in the exchange of commodities and services, and in the exchange of feelings. "I give you as much as you give me," in material goods as well as in love, is the prevalent ethical maxim in capitalist society. It may even be said that the development of fairness ethics is the particular ethical contribution of capitalist society (pp. 108-109).

…I am of the conviction that the answer of the absolute incompatibility of love and "normal" life is correct only in an abstract sense. The principle underlying capitalistic society and the principal of love are incompatible. But modern society seen concretely is a complex phenomenon. A salesman of a useless commodity, for instance, cannot function economically without lying; a skilled worker, a chemist, or a physician can. Similarly, a farmer, a worker, a teacher, and many a type of businessman can try to practice love without ceasing to function economically. Even if one recognizes the principal of capitalism as being incompatible with the principle of love, one must admit that "capitalism" is in itself a complex and constantly changing structure which still permits of a good deal of non-conformity and of personal latitude (pp. 110-11).

MM (3/4/2000)

In response to your request, Vince, yes, I too would like to see John answer your questions.

Of course you are right–that all of us who accept the lies are "with the assassins," wittingly or not, just as the Germans who accepted the Nazi lies were guilty and, in effect, "with Hitler." Of course there are also degrees of guilt.

Where is the guilt now over the AIDS biowar? There are many people saying, with good reason, that the US government not only created AIDS, but created it deliberately, in order to defuse the population "time bomb" in the Third World, both at home and abroad (homosexuals and drug addicts being quite acceptable "collateral damage").

If we ignore this, are we any better than those who refuse to see the government's complicity in other crimes, such as JFK's assassination, which led to the death of millions in Vietnam? The most recent count is 30-something million, I think, and it's still in full swing. How acceptable are our excuses that we don't know enough about genetics and

microbiology to judge this matter? This is Chomsky's excuse, as he told me: it isn't his field.

The Fromm quotes are inspiring and apropos. Does he say anything about reconciling the desire for union, or love, with reason? As we know, the consistent application of reason often destroys all semblance of love. Nevertheless, love without reason cannot be the goal.

VS (3/6/2000)

This is Vince's reply to Jim DiEugenio's letter to him; DiEugenio's letter was not circulated.

Dear Jim,

Jim DiEugenio, thank you for being interested in my rough review of Newman's book, *Oswald and the CIA*. I much appreciate your extensive post to me. I am, however, disturbed by your marking it "personal and confidential." I would like permission from you to share it with Dr. Schotz and Mike Morrissey. Fairness and the need for digging for the truth appear to require it. They are severely attacked in this post, and I feel that the subject under discussion is of public significance and therefore should not be cloaked in requirements of privacy. After all, we do not wish to ape the covert mode of operations so common to our intelligence agencies. Please allow me to share your post with my group, or at least with Morrissey and Schotz.

I genuinely appreciate your interest, Jim. It is my most serious wish that this will be the opening of dialogue with you, Newman, and others. Publishing that review is not something I am eager to do. I would much rather have an open discussion with people I respect and with whom I can benefit from an exchange honestly aimed at arriving at the truth. If I am wrong about Newman, I want to be apprised of my error through dealing with what he has told the reader, and what the reader is expected to derive from his book. If I am proven wrong, rest assured that I will acknowledge error and render a sincere and public apology.

Please feel free to submit the unedited account which I sent to you to John Newman for comment. No publication would take notice of my review of his book until he had ample time with which to comment and defend himself. If he answers my charges satisfactorily, of course John Kelin will not publish it. Professor Newman, you inform me, refused to answer Mike Morrissey's inquiries because he felt that Mike had already made up his mind. Well, my mind is open. I await Professor's Newman's comments. In the absence of comments, I will ask John Newman to publish the review with his editing. You will be free to then publish the review and your answer. I feel that the resulting discussion may prove of value.

I cannot agree with you that Marty and Mike are bad influences on me. I am not a passive guy. It is my belief that I have influenced them more than they have influenced me. I value them as friends and as fine thinkers.

You are wrong about Marty and Mike spewing vitriol. Show me where their exchanges in our group demonstrate anything like the vitriol which is spewed at them. I submit that you will not be able to do so.

Have I forgotten the subtitle of the "Secret Team?" No, I do wonder though whether Fletcher Prouty has. If "The CIA and Its Allies (were) in Control of the United States and the World," were they not also necessarily as an institution in control of "The Secret Team" which he believes is part of our world?

I never said that Prouty was an agent. But I have put questions to him, accompanied by supporting data, asking him to support his belief that there was no CIA institutional involvement in the killing of Kennedy. I got no response. You compliment Prouty's contribution of Bundy's role in the Bay of Pigs. I could never buy Prouty's explication of the role of Bundy in that invasion. How could Bundy have withheld the air strikes without Kennedy's authority? And why would the air strikes have counted for anything without a U.S. invasion? As you suggest, the Bay of Pigs was never designed to be anything but a failure absent U.S. forces invading Cuba. But we can leave further discussion of this matter for later.

As for John Thomas no one in our group has called him a "spook" as you suggest. We have expressed appreciation and love for John. He has, on the other hand, called us about everything one could imagine. But since none of his names seemed to apply to us, we have taken no offense.

With respect to the McCloy-Zorin agreements, I attach no particular significance to them. They are only part of a whole relating to Kennedy's effort at ameliorating the Cold War. We feel this caused his death.

I am not convinced that Professor Newman ever blew the whistle on the CIA. He will have to direct me to where in his book he attributes blame to the CIA for involvement in the Kennedy assassination other than that it was victimized and found itself after the killing in a nightmare for which it was not institutionally responsible.

Who in the world could prove with documents that Oswald was an agent? My answer is that John Newman proved it to the fullest extent possible with the documentation he provided for us. But, he instructs his reader that one cannot so conclude. In your post you state that Newman with you privately came to "the inescapable conclusion" that Oswald was an agent. Then, he owed to the reader his judgment that such was an inescapable conclusion. An inescapable conclusion is what lawyers, judges and juries consider to be proof.

What is wrong with eight people in a correspondence and selling 1,500 copies of a book? I do not view myself as in a political movement. I see myself as hunting for the truth irrespective of how many are interested in it or wish to do anything about it. Let the political consequences be damned.

Please don't refer to Garrison as commenting that the CIA was not institutionally involved in the killing of Kennedy. I appeared before Tom Snyder. He had absolutely no interest in the truth. If Jim curried his favor by stating that he did not mean to convey as his thought that the CIA killed Kennedy then Jim was playing games. I talked to Jim in Philadelphia at the time of his novel coming out. He came to Philadelphia and had lunch with Tom Katen and me. Both Tom and I concluded from what Jim told us at that time that Jim had been temporarily bought for the substantial money he told us that was paid as an advance for his doing the novel. Jim Garrison in his *On the Trial of the Assassins* told us in 1988 what he truly believed. His words follow:

At the outset, I must underscore the fact that the details of the assassination–who pulled a trigger, from what building, what kind of gun, and so forth–are no longer my primary concerns. The assassination was an enormously important event. But even more important, in my view, is what happened after–ratification by the government and the media of an official story that is an absurd fairy tale (p. xiv).

This is the same fairy tale which Prouty described in *The Secret Team*:

Even though the Warren Report itself really satisfies few serious scholars and investigators, it did serve to get this country through a trying time.

You know what Garrison felt about the Warren Report and its Commissioners and staff. Prouty and Jim Garrison cannot be lumped together.

More from Jim in his *On the Trail*:

We have been through the Vietnam War, Watergate, and the Iran/Contra affair. We have learned much about our intelligence agencies and what they had done in our name. Assassination by our C.I.A. is no longer inconceivable; it is established historical fact. The existence of off-the-shelf covert government operations is acknowledged in congressional hearing rooms and on national television (p. xv).

…Today, we still live with those consequences–a continuing and ominous Cold War, a deceptive secret government, a docile press, a pervasive cynicism, and corruption. To bring an end to this era in which the lies of our elected government and the covert operations of our secret government threaten the very survival of our society, we must begin to see the Cold War and our national security in a new light (p. xvi).

…Further, the Mafia theory fails to explain the evident complicity of the government in the cover-up. One of the major aspects of this case is the fact that members of the national intelligence community–the F.B.I. and C.I.A., possibly the Office of Naval Intelligence–have continually tried to suppress information bearing on some of its core issues, such as other C.I.A. assassination projects, Oswald's military counter-intelligence background and Ruby's ties to the mob. If it was just a few dons and thugs who condemned the President, why did the government's entire investigative apparatus stand paralyzed (p. 305)?

Norman Mailer's blurb for *On the Trail*:

Jim Garrison's book presents the most powerful detailed case yet made that President Kennedy's assassination was the product of a conspiracy, and that the plotters and key operators came not from the Mob, but the CIA.

Jim, Garrison did not, and I do not consider it a phony semantic issue as to whether the national security state killed Kennedy or whether it was a work of renegades who victimized the CIA and the other investigative agencies. He said clearly as set forth above that the national security state through the CIA killed Kennedy.

Morrissey does not feel that Hoover, the White House and the media were all involved in killing Kennedy. He feels, as Garrison felt, and as I do, that the national security state killed Kennedy for Cold War reasons. I do not share your view that this is coffee-table talk. I disagree with you that this is not provable. I believe that it is easily proven. What do you think I did in Dallas in November of 1998 which caused that standing ovation? Those people were standing and applauding because they had all proven it to themselves before I addressed them. Incidentally, Jim, you assured me that you would print excerpts from my Dallas speech in *Probe*. You printed not a single word.

Morrissey would not take exception to an intelligence service that gathered intelligence and had no covert authority. He just feels, as I do, that our intelligence services have committed so many crimes, domestic and foreign (including the killing of Kennedy), that democracy cannot survive unless they are institutionally abolished. If after the people learn about the crimes of U.S. intelligence, and the people knowing what the past reveals about the horrors committed by such agencies, want to have another agency with no covert authority and capacity, you won't have much trouble getting

approval of Morrissey. But you will have an impossible time trying to convince Morrissey, Schotz, Salandria and especially Jim Garrison, if he were alive, that the CIA did not kill Kennedy.

You ask about the sacrifices made by Morrissey and Schotz which are comparable to those made by John Newman? Morrissey and Schotz have never made a penny on their work. They have been willing to take a position on the assassination which conforms to that of Garrison and which guarantees that they will never have any substantial support in any U.S. community. Newman's position permits him to remain friendly with a whole troop of obvious governmental agents.

You make Morrissey and Schotz out to be political extremists. They are not. But if they were, that should not have any bearing on how we judge their work. Garrison never asked me what my politics were. Nor did I ask him about his. But we knew, as I know about Morrissey and Schotz, that they are opposed to state terror and secret governments.

You point out that Professor Newman pointed out that James McCord headed up an FBI and CIA debriefing team. So what! Owen Rogers tells me that Fensterwald, who represented McCord, and Prouty had lunch together regularly. How does that support the bona fides of Prouty?

You really feel that someday you, Gary Aguilar and Professor Newman will be getting to court on the Kennedy killing? Allow me to tell you about a friend of mine, Professor Earl Finbar Murphy. He was a professor of law at Temple University School of Law. He was a Yale man and a friend of Nicholas Katzenbach. We went to a demonstration together in Washington. D.C., and he visited with Katzenbach. Well, after I had written several articles on the Kennedy assassination, Earl called me after returning from a visit in Washington. He said, "Vince, forget your work on the assassination. It was done too high up for there ever to be punishment." I knew that. But I did not consider that a reason to stop work.

You accuse Morrissey, Schotz and me of politicizing a serious crime of state? We are not involved in politics. The killers were and are presently in covering for themselves. We are involved in bearing witness to the truth. You say that "in many ways, at your best you are a pioneer and an icon." You are concerned about my reputation. Thank you, Jim, for your concern. But my reputation is of no import. If I should in the interests of my reputation speak less than what I know or have reason to know is the truth, then I would be beneath contempt.

I am open to dialogue with you, Ray Marcus, Professor Newman, Gary Aguilar, and John Thomas. Let us talk. Kelin is in no hurry to print that review of mine. I am sharing this post with the group. But I have shared your post with no one. Again, many thanks for your post, your concerns, and your thoughts in this matter.

MM (3/7/2000)

Vince, just a few remarks on your letter to DiEugenio.

You compliment Prouty's contribution of Bundy's role in the Bay of Pigs. I could never buy Prouty's explication of the role of Bundy in that invasion. How could Bundy have withheld the air strikes without Kennedy's authority? And why would the air strikes have counted for anything without a U.S. invasion? As you suggest, the Bay of Pigs was

never designed to be anything but a failure absent U.S. forces invading Cuba. But we can leave further discussion of this matter for later.

First, what was Fletch's contribution to the Bay of Pigs question?

Second, I agree with you that Bundy could not have acted without JFK's authority. I wonder what happened there. That's what I wrote to Schlesinger about, as you may recall. He didn't remember. My guess is that Bundy persuaded JFK that it would be a good idea to call off the strikes, and JFK agreed (for different reasons).

Fletch has always said that the air strikes would have pretty much guaranteed the success of the invasion. In one of his last letters to the group, he said something about the OAS being poised to invade and impose order if the Brigade could hold out on the beach for x number of days (3, I think it was). I asked him to tell me his source for this information, since I had never heard it before, but he never answered.

This is obviously a crucial point. There were only three things that could have happened if the invasion had "succeeded" (i.e., lasted a few days) 1) an uprising, 2) 3rd party intervention, or 3) defeat. The CIA knew that 1) was very unlikely (they lied about this to everybody, of course) and obviously 3) was the worst case. That leaves 2). It was not the OAS that was expected to intervene–I simply do not believe this is true and I would like very much to know where Fletch got this idea. It was that the USA was expected to intervene.

Now, under what conditions would the USA intervene? Upon successful completion of the assault and holding of the beach? No, because that would reveal the CIA's lie about the likelihood of an uprising (which would not occur). I don't think Dulles would have trusted Kennedy to send in the Marines, when he saw that all that CIA bullshit about an uprising was just that. That is why Dulles et al. had to sabotage the invasion. It could not be allowed to succeed. They did not want a successful holding of the beach, because that would give the lie to the uprising theory.

I showed in my *Fourth Decade* article and my COPA speech how Cabell and Bissell's behavior, as officially documented in the Taylor memoranda, reveals a systematic effort to ensure failure. [*See* Looking for the Enemy*, Ch. 1. --MDM*]

Calling off the air strikes was part of the sabotage plan. JFK no doubt had his head filled with other things by Bundy–the transparency of it to the world, the lack of deniability, etc., so he agreed.

That's my theory, anyway. I don't know what Fletch's is. I didn't know he had one. When we first talked about the Bay of Pigs, he thought Bundy had just been stupid. I told him I could not accept that about the "brilliant" Messrs. Bundy and Bissell, and since then he has gravitated away from that position. But where does Fletch expound on his theory of why Bundy did it?

Morrissey would not take exception to an intelligence service that gathered intelligence and had no covert authority.

Correct. But I think that "intelligence," i.e. information that is gathered by public officials, should be accessible to the people who pay their salaries, namely the taxpayers. As I have said, I realize that everybody cannot know the codes for nuclear missile launches. I would allow secret information. But not as a given! Every bit of information that must be kept secret would have to go through rigorous procedures to prove convincingly that keeping it secret is absolutely necessary. I know that sounds utopian but I'm stating it as a principle.

Newman's position permits him to remain friendly with a whole troop of obvious governmental agents.

I don't see this as an enviable position!

VS (3/7/2000)

Re Ray Marcus, I have a copy of a letter he wrote to John Thomas on November 29, 1999, expressing his support for Thomas's view on the issue of whether the CIA was institutionally involved in the killing of Kennedy. I asked permission to circulate that letter. On December 9, 1999, Ray wrote me a letter stating "...of course, you have my permission to circulate my letter of Nov. 29." The letter follows:

Dear John,

I am in agreement with your analysis of the assassination as you present it in your e-mails to Vince and the group of Oct. 13, 19 and 20.

I think it's clear that the differences between you (and I) and Vince, Ralph and Marty stem from a fundamental difference in our respective social/political/economic outlooks. Mine, and, and I gather, yours, is based on a non-Marxist position and is generally supportive–though by no means uncritically so–of U.S. capitalism and its system of "bourgeois" political democracy.

Our beloved leader, and Marty and Ralph as I understand them, hold to a generally Marxist position, and therefore take a much more negative view of the American system.

This became obvious to me soon after I accepted Vince's invitation to join the group in 1992. Nevertheless, and despite my long-time observation that such deeply held differing convictions are not bridgeable by debate, I have found my association with the group a richly rewarding experience, and have gained greatly from it in terms of information and support.

Despite our widely disparate views of U.S. government, its society, and its role in world affairs, what has brought and kept most of us together is the conviction that the Kennedy assassination was a singularly important event in 20th century U.S. history; that the government, and through its influence virtually the entire U.S. Establishment, has lied and contrives to lie massively and monstrously about that event; and that we individually and collectively could contribute, through our work and association, to the truth of the historical record. I think the group has succeeded in this basic aim, despite some sharp and occasionally acrimonious arguments. I have no doubt it is our differing political and socio/economic outlook that is most commonly the cause of these disputes.

I also think–again speaking generally and without wishing to appear to be engaging in psycho-babble–that those who in the 1990's still remained hopeful (perhaps encouraged by Stone's *JFK*) that bringing the truth to the public might help spark a movement for radical change in the U.S. away from capitalism and "bourgeois" democracy, are understandably disappointed and provably frustrated by the increasingly obvious realization that this issue would not lead to the hoped-for result.

(Indeed, I believe it was their early assessment that seeking truth in the Kennedy assassination held little potential as a useful weapon in the ideological wars that kept the large majority of radical-left activists from involvement in the struggle, and led some into vigorous public opposition to the "conspiracy theorists"–either as a means of justifying their see-no-evil positions, or in a few cases because they were acting as de facto agents.)

Regardless of whatever additional motives any of us may have had for our active involvement, I believe contributing to the truth of the historical record is by itself sufficient motive for past and continuing efforts–whether or not we individually consider it a matter of paying dues for our lifetime as U.S. citizens.

With Best Wishes to you and all for the Holidays and the New Year,

Sincerely,

Ray

I wrote a reply letter in which I wanted to set the record straight with respect to my "Marxist world view." I very much believe in the power and necessity for a market economy, albeit one that is regulated. I want the market to drive and control the production and pricing of most of the goods and services produced but not to determine the nature of society's needs nor the distribution of the wealth. I also firmly believe that some of the goods and services of our society which cannot be supplied by market forces in sufficient quantity to meet the needs of humankind, must be produced by command as distinguished from market-driven forces. I do not believe that these convictions make me a Marxist.

My conduct and interaction with each member of the group which dates back for some to 1992 speaks to whether I believe in political democracy. I most fervently do, and try to put into practice my commitment to democracy. But I also believe that discourse on issues of public importance should be examined with intensity and passion. Therefore, of necessity, in the course of meaningful discussion of such issues, feelings will be hurt and some pain inflicted. I do not believe this pain need be sadistically driven. Rather, it comes with the territory. I think that commitment to democracy reveals itself in such discourse by the willingness to take as well as to deliver fair punches.

So, I complained in a letter to Ray that he had gotten the political orientations of Ralph, Marty and me wrong. I did not complain without some sense of embarrassment. Because I don't feel that a person's political position should have any effect on how we judge her work. I can recall that I was a young lawyer when the McCarthy period evolved. I understood what guilt by association was and what the consequences of this concept were. I did not know any Communists. So, to resist the new terror in the land, I made it a point to make some Communist friends. And in taking issue with Ray, I had some reservations about my lack of courage in just having myself misidentified politically and leaving it at that. Ray replied to me:

Dec. 9, 1999

Dear Vince,

Re your letter of Dec 6, in mine of Nov 29 I said, "Our beloved leader, and Marty and Ralph, as I understand them, hold to a generally Marxist position, and therefore take a much more negative view of the American system."

I was speaking in general terms as to my understanding of your general position. Since you say that even in those general terms I have mischaracterized your beliefs I accept that I was mistaken.

I intended the term "Marxist" descriptively, and not pejoratively, although, as I have made plain in earlier correspondence, I believe Marxism and its 20th century development as Marxism-Leninism have proven in practice to be one of history's most disastrous, deadly, and ignominious failures.

I agree that unfettered laissez-faire capitalism does not work (and does not exist in any western country that I am aware of). I too favor a mixed economy of market forces moderated by government intervention in the public interest, together with a multi-party system–and that, again, is what generally obtains in the west.

Vince, there is no question that whatever political differences exist between us will in no degree diminish my deep affection and respect for you, nor my gratitude for your decades of long comradeship and support.

Love,

Ray

P.S.–of course you have my permission to circulate my letter of Nov. 29.

In response to these letters I rejoice in how lucky I am to know a person as good and decent as Ray Marcus. If I were inclined to change my ideas to comport with another person's in order to remain in that person's esteem that person would likely be Ray Marcus. But Ray does not require this of me, and I do not require it of him, because we know that we are unable to adjust our firmly-held convictions in order to retain affection. Fortunately, we do not have to share convictions held in common in order to appreciate one another.

MM (3/8/2000)

Vince, your views on capitalism seem perfectly reasonable to me, and would seem perfectly reasonable to I would guess at least half the major political parties in Europe. Here the word "sozial" in German, for example, does not mean "socialist" or "communist" or "Marxist." It means what you said–a regulated and relatively humane form of capitalism.

Furthermore, there are many different forms of "Marxism." Many prominent Americans have espoused a Marxism of sorts. The fact that these words can still be thrown around so ignorantly, as emotional epithets with no meaning whatsoever, reveals the continuing strength of the propaganda machine.

I have asked a number of times for those defending so vehemently the intelligence establishment, which empowers the Secret Team, Gold Key Club, and High Cabal (or however else one wants to designate the bad guys), to list its virtues. Alas, they have zero arguments. Perhaps they are secret arguments! My opinion of this behavior, as I have said before, is that it is not only irrational but immoral, un-American, unpatriotic, undemocratic, un-Christian, reactionary, fascistic, pig ignorant, and despicable. I admire you for your patience in putting up with it.

VS (3/8/2000)

Owen, with respect to Marty and Mike spewing vitriol, I can recall nothing that Marty has said which smacks of vitriol. I stand ready to be corrected. However, the 12:02 PM 3/800 Michael Morrissey post which I have just seen qualifies as vitriol.

Owen, I am not a censor. When I was the clerk of the group for several years, I only excluded one piece from mailing. That was a piece which charged a person I knew with being associated with the CIA in his professional work. I could not accept this about this person. It also charged many others of the same offense. I did not know those people. So, I could not see myself circulating that piece because I felt that it was libelous. It was sent to me by an absolutely trustworthy person who meant no harm. I explained to him why I was censoring it. Otherwise, nothing was withheld from circulation that was sent to me.

I feel Mike is entitled to his vitriol. I have not cut anyone off from communication with me who is vitriolic in her/his attacks on me. I certainly would not cut Mike off for the same. He has called me "arrogant." That does not stop me from enjoying and benefiting from his fine mind and his unquestionable integrity.

Now, Owen, show me where I have been vitriolic. I have called John Thomas chauvinistic. That is the only name I have called him. I have stated that he unwittingly is helping the assassins by denying institutional involvement of the national security state in the killing of Kennedy. That is not name calling. I place many people whom I love, which includes John Thomas, in that category. I don't think less of them for what I consider to be their error of thinking.

Now, I authorize you to poll this group and ask them what vitriol I have personally expressed against any of them. I authorize and beg the group to come forth with any front or back-channel written communication from me which demonstrates that I have called them or any member of the group names or attacked them with vitriol. If there is no response, then I will consider the absence of a response as each person's assent that there is no such material. I restrict it to written communication, because one of the group has accused me of saying things about that person, which I never said.

I also ask you, Owen, why I cannot be associated with and be in agreement with Mike and Marty if indeed they were vitriolic if their ideas are what I view as important and true? You have no problem with Prouty having spent most of his public career associated with military and intelligence personnel who have unquestionably committed atrocious crimes. Why cannot I be associated with and love Mike and Marty who have committed no crimes that I know of just because they are accused rightfully or wrongly of being vitriolic?

With respect to your elephant logic, I have no present memory of it. But, Owen, every analogy involving broad social questions I view as somewhat flawed. Therefore, you will note that I am disinclined to use them in my arguments. Mike employs them I think brilliantly. But I don't. However, I will go back and read your elephant analogy and try to respond to you at a later date.

Owen, I don't know how to get "Understanding Special Operations." When I can buy it, I will. But please don't instruct me that I am not qualified to comment on the assassination of Kennedy until I understand every aspect of Special Operations. Hundreds of millions of people in the world understand the assassination of Kennedy, and have little or no knowledge of Special Operations. Are you suggesting that only ex intelligence agents can explain to us how and why Kennedy was killed? If so, Owen, I don't share your view.

Owen, you will note that I quote extensively from sources when I argue. I don't require everyone I address to read a whole book before the person is allowed to respond to the material I present. If the person chooses to read the books from which I quote, that is fine. But I don't require it in order to have an exchange of views on a quote.

I repeat that no one, including Marty, has called John Thomas a "spook." Show me where I am wrong. Owen, I am not.

Owen, when I say the CIA killed Kennedy, I mean that the CIA was institutionally involved in the killing. This is provable and proven. I know this to be the truth. I have said that the national security state which is much bigger than the CIA killed Kennedy. I have said that the national security state used the CIA to kill Kennedy. I have

shown where there was Pentagon involvement. I believe, but I cannot prove, therefore I do not state, that civilian aspects of the military intelligence complex were involved in approving the assassination. But what I will not agree to is the illogical proposition that because the killing involved more than the CIA and was a systemic action of the national security state, that the CIA was not institutionally involved in the killing. If you and others want to spend your time hunting up the names of the members of what you call a Secret Team that was involved in the assassination, go to it. Allen Dulles very early challenged a California audience. He said that if there were those among them who did not agree with the Warren Report, let them name the killers. That is the same thing Tom Schneider tried to get me to do. You have my blessings. But don't, please don't, while you are at it, expect my blessings to those who would assert that the CIA was not institutionally involved in the killing or that only renegade elements connected with the Mafia planned and executed the assassination distinct from the institutional power of the national security state. For me, this runs counter to the evidence and logic.

Owen, you agree with me that John Newman "proved to the fullest extent possible with the documentation he provided for us (that Oswald was a U.S. intelligence agent). But, he instructs his reader that one cannot so conclude." You state: "I agree with Vince 100% this instruction is a false conclusion by Newman. It raises an issue, why would he write so much, to fail with the premise."

Owen, I am being vigorously attacked for being 100% correct. For this simple and forthright support of this conclusion I very much and most sincerely thank you.

So, you would look to the killing of Kennedy as something bigger than the CIA. Owen, I agree. But the concept of "bigger than" does not exonerate the CIA which provided at taxpayer's expense the extensive troop of mechanics who planned and did the bloody job of blowing Kennedy to pieces. Nor does "bigger than" allow for the concept of the Mafia and renegade elements of the CIA. Bigger than, includes the sum of its parts. The CIA as an institution was involved in the killing of Kennedy. I believe Allen Dulles was involved in the planning. But that the time of the killing he was not officially part of the CIA. Yet, Mr. Dulles had, in my judgment, the capacity to call upon CIA assets to do the job. Under agency law, there is a concept of respondeat superior, which states that the principal is responsible for the acts of its agents when the "structure and mission" (John Thomas's term) of the principal encompasses the acts of the agents. History documents that the structure and mission of the CIA was, inter alia, to assassinate people. History documents that the CIA has well fulfilled this structure and mission. John Thomas contends that the CIA has done so legally. I would dispute the legality of these CIA executions.

Tom Katen and I concluded that Jim was apologizing to us for having accepted his advance on that novel. I did not hold that against Jim. Jim was a noble and great man. He was no saint. Considering the punishment administered to him by our national security state, I thought Jim had a right to do what he viewed was necessary to survive. But Jim never suggested to Tom and me that we were wrong on our conception of the assassination. Jim and I were always in perfect agreement with respect to the overall concept of a national security state assassination.

Owen, Prouty in stating that "Even though the Warren Report itself really satisfied few serious scholars and investigators, it did serve to get this country through a trying time."

Prouty quite clearly states that the Warren Report, which was a plain lie and covered up an assassination which involved U.S. power more powerful than the CIA, served this country. This country was supposed to be a democracy. The people were therefore entitled under the Constitution to be informed as to who fired their elected President and why he was fired in and fired upon in Dealey Plaza. Jim Garrison felt that the Warren Report was an abomination. He felt that it served to subvert democracy here. He did not see that "it did serve to get this country through a trying time." He saw it as getting this country into the Vietnam invasion and the killing of millions. He saw it as helping to heat up the Cold War. Owen, Prouty and Garrison were poles apart on this.

Marty has never pushed any view aside. His prose may have abolished certain views. But the flow of discourse continued from Marty. He, as I, thanked John Thomas for his thinking. Behind John Thomas's back many times to me, he expressed his gratitude for John's exchanges with him.

Yes, the Mafia-CIA concept is crap. Yes, it is true that the killing must be something bigger than the CIA. Yes, as you say, "the CIA is just one of the strings." But it is institutionally the killing string in the bow which caused the arrows to fly that dispatched our President. Owen, are we not in very, very substantial agreement?

Yes, it would be impossible to prove that the CIA was not the killing force which killed Kennedy. Am I open to higher forces having used the institutional structure of the CIA for the killing. Again, yes indeed, I am. But, again, don't try to convince me that the killing of Kennedy involved institutional power lesser than the CIA. We do not appear to be in disagreement.

Owen, the lunch business of Fensterwald and Prouty was not denied. What was agreed upon by us was that I was not in attendance. I declined Fensterwald's invitation to be a charter member of his board of Committee to Investigate Assassinations. I declined to have anything to do with that man who was so patently from the CIA. If Fletcher, a sophisticated intelligence officer, associated with Fensterwald, pardon me if I don't admire Fletcher for the choice of his lunch companions. But this is not a matter of any importance. I have broken bread with people whom I am sorry to have known.

With respect to bringing the killing of Kennedy into a court, I was convinced that Garrison never had a shot of winning against Clay Shaw. But I supported his efforts. I just feel that Gary Aguilar could spend his valuable time and fine mind on more promising efforts. But, if Gary involves himself in an effort that I consider somewhat quixotic, that is his right. I wish him well. I remain most respectful of him and most appreciative that he allowed me to speak and be honored by COPA. Mind you, Gary allowed me to speak after I had laid out very carefully what I would be saying. His commitment to democracy and free speech, for me, is beyond question. If he does not share my views about how and why Kennedy was killed and what we should do about it, that does not change my feeling for him.

Owen, I thank you for the privilege of discussing this subject with you. I have not been engaging in much give and take with you. For that I apologize. It is clear to me that you deserve better. Keep after me. Feel free to be vitriolic. Vitriol from you will not endanger my willingness and need to continue exchanging thoughts with you.

MM (3/8/2000)

Vince, I stand by my vitriol. I am willing to defend my choice of words.

Please do not miss the point here. I am prepared to repeat it in every letter if necessary: to accept the "necessity" of the intelligence establishment is to accept the necessity of the Secret Team, because the intelligence establishment empowers the Secret Team.

To accept the "necessity" of the intelligence establishment and its consequences, without even trying to defend the rationality of that decision (assumption), is to me reprehensible in the extreme, and quite analogous to the worst judgments that we make about other otherwise intelligent people, such as the "good Germans" in the Nazi era. Our interlocutors apparently accept the necessity of the intelligence establishment, as John Thomas and Fletch Prouty do. Where are their arguments?

Somehow I don't feel that this is vitriolic enough, but I'll leave it at that.

VS (3/9/2000)

Mike, In your 8:53 PM 3/8/00 post you explain your vitriol. I understand your reasoning. I appreciate the cause for your vitriol. But I cannot join with you in it since your analogy to the Holocaust is faulty. The Nazis killed some 6 million in the camps and through other genocidal extermination efforts. We did not kill the Japanese in our racial concentration camps.

Following the killing of Kennedy we killed from three to four million in our Vietnam invasion. Our training and financing of the death squads probably only accounted for something under 100,000 all told. We are only killing several thousand Iraqi children each month with our sanctions. The Cuban kids because of our embargo don't have medicine and are hurting some. I privately feel great shame and great guilt for these great crimes committed by the nation of which I am a citizen and which super power has made me immensely rich and privileged. But, your analogy, like all analogies, is somewhat faulty. And although we came close, we did not incinerate the planet with our hydrogen bombs. So, we are not the Nazis.

I, like you, would appreciate arguments from the data from John Thomas, Fletch Prouty, and the other members of our group. But we are not going to get their arguments, if we call them "good Germans." Let us accept them as better U.S. citizens than we are, and invite them to conduct a discourse without giving them cause for aborting the exchange because of our vitriol. If they feel no guilt for the crimes of our covert intelligence, let them be free of the guilt. We can feel the guilt and vainly seek to discharge it by reasoning and stating the truth about the killing of JFK as simply, unnuanced and clearly as we can.

You asked me whether Erich Fromm says anything about reconciling the desire for union, or love with reason. You say that the consistent application of reason often destroys all semblance of love. Then you conclude with "love without reason cannot be the goal." Mike, Fromm was talking about the love which cannot exist without knowledge of one another. He feels that we cannot truly love without through reasoning coming to know thoroughly the objects of our love. Here is what he says on the subject:

Love is possible only if two persons communicate with each other from the center of their existence, hence if each one of them experiences himself from the center of his existence. Only in this "central experience" is human reality, only here is aliveness, only here is the basis for loved Love; experience thus is a constant challenge; it is not a resting place, but a moving, growing, working together; even whether there is harmony or conflict, joy or sadness, is secondary to the fundamental fact that two people experience

themselves from the essence of their existence, that they are one with each other by being one with themselves, rather than by fleeing from themselves. There is only one proof for the presence of love: the depth of the relationship, and the aliveness and strength in each person concerned; this is he fruit by which love is recognized.

If we can stand against the dictates of the herd and express not vitriol but love, this attests to our strength and our capacity to love. Keep the channels open for discussion. We will learn from the discourse. Those who disagree with us may hate us for what we know. They may not choose to accept what we know to be the truth. They may express their hatred through vitriolic attacks. But why should we return their feelings in like kind? How would we benefit from this show of weakness and not strength?

Let us acknowledge that those who disagree with us in this group may well be far, far better people than we are. Let us presume that they treat their wives, husbands, children, relatives, friends and strangers better than we do. But let us require of them that they reason with us from the data and not by labeling us and attributing to us ideas for which we do not stand.

We have a fine group which cannot agree with one another. But we can learn to know and love one another, and even perhaps through knowledge and love to learn from one another.

Let us try.

MM (3/9/2000)

The easy stuff first:

Owen, you defend the CIA/intelligence establishment when you compare it to an elephant. You defend it when you say that even if we abolished it, nothing would change (in which case there is no reason not to abolish it). Fletch defends it when he says the CIA didn't kill JFK, and neither did the Pentagon. Vince has been trying patiently to explain this to you, but you do not or will not understand.

John Thomas said we need the intelligence agencies to maintain liberty. Fletch would agree with that. Do you? I have asked you before, without getting an answer. I challenged your elephant metaphor, and other things, at length, with no answer.

I am not willing to talk with you, or John Thomas, or anyone else on these terms. Either you answer me as fully as I have tried to answer you, or forget it.

Now, as to the current crisis of the group:

There has been too much back-channel warring, not only by e-mail but by telephone. Vince, you stand accused of falsely accusing not one but "dozens" of people of being CIA agents and collaborators–by telephone. You have been called (back-channel) "dangerous," "unregenerate" in your refusal to apologize to various people you have accused, "sick" in your attempt to distract from the harm you have done by telling everybody how intelligent they are and how much you love them, of having "alienated" everybody in the group except me, and of having "lost your credibility."

I ask the person who wrote these things to repeat them to the group, and I ask Vince to respond to them.

I also ask Vince to finally give us the information about the psychiatrist he knows that was falsely accused of having worked with the CIA. I know who the source of the information was, because he/she volunteered the information, but he/she does not want to be identified. This is absurd.

Vince is right that this kind of behavior apes the behavior of our enemies, who are–believe it or not–the intelligence agencies. They thrive on secrecy. We will not. We will die from secrecy.

If you (all) want the group to die, then by all means continue the back-channel secret communications, keep referring to secret information about unidentified persons stemming from unidentified sources, keep telephoning (where no record can be kept), and keep your written communications short and to the point: for example, "Bullshit!" (to quote a recent post).

And most importantly for the death of this experiment in communication, DO NOT PARTICIPATE. Stay covered. Keep your head down, preferably totally immersed in the sand. Stay unknown. Play your cards as close to your chest as possible. Sound bites are ok, but nothing more.

And rest in peace.

Vince, I have started Shirer's *Rise and Fall of the Third Reich*, so maybe in a few years, if I ever finish it, I'll have more to say about the "good Germans." Right now I can tell you that having lived half my life in the US, and the other half here, that there is absolutely no difference in the mentality of Germans and Americans with regard to politics, except that Germans on the whole are far better informed and far less propagandized than we Americans are. I have not read *Hitler's Willing Executioners*, but now I think I will.

I did not compare the "good Americans" to the Nazis. I compare them to the "good Germans." If you want to compare atrocities by governments, then compare 37 million deaths from AIDS to 6 million Jews. Compare the extermination of millions of American Indians and African slaves. Compare the 6 million deaths from CIA proxy wars since 1945 (cf. John Stockwell).

I am comparing the mentality which denies reality. No "good Germans" remember the Holocaust, and certainly do not remember participating in it, or even knowing about it. Try telling them they were "with Hitler," as Goldhagen did. The intelligent ones will understand it, and accept it in the sense that obviously, if they accepted that situation, then they were part of it. None of us in the group, I dare say, would quarrel with that–as long as we apply it only to Germans. The ignorant and unthinking ones will deny it to their dying day. "We didn't know about the concentration camps! We didn't know what was going on! We had no information! It was too dangerous to oppose the regime!"

Ja, ja. It is true. Do we KNOW that our government is responsible for all the terrible things we are discussing? More to the point, do we want to know? How many people in this group have shown the slightest interest in the AIDS holocaust, despite my efforts? They don't know! They have no information! It is not their field! What do you think will be the judgment of history concerning the behavior of these "good Americans"?

Vince, I will go further than that. The "good Germans" had a good excuse for being passive. They had an overt dictatorship to oppose. We have many more advantages. It is still dangerous to oppose the government–as even the reactionary sentiments in our little group demonstrates amply–but we can talk to each other, and now we have the Internet. Hopefully none of us will be murdered for it, and you can't be too sure, but THAT is the part you cannot compare with the Nazi period. We are worse than the "good

Germans" who accepted the Nazis, Vince. They had very little choice–more or less the choice between death and living a lie. Our choice is much easier. We do not have to live a lie. We can oppose the government. We should oppose the government, with all our strength, in whatever cause we feel is justified. We have no excuse for not doing so. We have no excuses, and as Marty's book says, history will not absolve us. That is where the analogy fails: the "good Germans" had an excuse; WE DON'T.

Vince, my father fought in WW II for my right to oppose the government when I believe it is wrong. I will not betray him.

VS (3/9/2000)

Owen, you state in your 6:14 PM 3/8/00 post that you have not heard anyone "defending so vehemently the intelligence establishment." John Thomas vigorously defended the intelligence establishment. Please see the Schotz post of 04/50 AM 3/9/00, p. 2 in which he quotes from an earlier Thomas post which reads:

The result of this practice of course, is that we now have otherwise intelligent people like Mike who believe, naively, that we can survive as a nation–let alone as a civilization–without an intelligence capability. In their minds, if we were to get rid of the CIA, NSA and other such entities, we would purify humanity and save the world. Of course that will never happen, intelligence agencies being as necessary as they are to the maintenance of liberty. Sadly–even ironically–they have bought into the very ruse designed by the chameleons who operate inside the Secret Team to give cover to clandestine malignancies: 'blame it on the CIA.'

That, Owen, represents something more than faint praise.

John, although you state that you will never communicate with me again, I say, "Be assured that I continue to have respect and love for you." Further I told you, John, that I will continue to endeavor to communicate with you and with love. I never called you treasonous, nor have I ever called you a murderer. My opinion is that your approach to the assassination unwittingly helps to protect the murderous U.S. national security state institutions which I am convinced killed JFK for what they viewed as his treasonous dealings with the Soviets, Cuba and Vietnam. But, I do not blame you for holding your view. Rather, I feel that your view is interesting and deserved to and deserves to be addressed.

John, my dictionary defines *unwitting* as "not knowing; not knowingly; without knowledge or consciousness, inadvertently." You claim that my statement that you are unwittingly assisting the murderers amounts to calling you a murderer. Murder is defined by *Black's Law Dictionary*, revised fourth edition, as: "The unlawful killing of a human being by another with malice aforethought, either express or implied." One cannot be an unwitting murderer. I cannot apologize for calling you a murderer because I did not do so.

Mike, I still am not able to declare the U.S. government as responsible for producing AIDS in a laboratory. In terms of scientific knowledge necessary to so conclude, I am at idiot level. Can you or your friends at some future time explicate the evidence in the plain and brief way you handle the JFK data and show me how you arrive at this conclusion? I feel ashamed of my lack of application to and understanding of the evidence which compels you to this conclusion. If you can spell it out simply, I promise to study the material.

On your point that the "good Germans" have a good excuse for being passive about the Holocaust, in so far as they had very little choice between death and living a lie, I have always recognized that fact. It is a fact that causes me to be deeply disappointed in our citizenry. I think that I was one of the first to go public and state that the CIA killed Kennedy. Nothing serious happened to me. As a matter of fact, since I outed myself on this point, my life has if anything improved.

But since I was pretty much alone, there was no need to take action against me. Jim Garrison, on the other hand, suffered terribly for his work. He unlike me, held public office, was eloquent and impressive in appearance. He represented a danger to the U.S. Establishment and paid a heavy price for his magnificent courage.

However, if the U.S. public had organized around the issue of a national security state assassination of JFK, I don't doubt that there would have been considerable blood spilt here over the killing of Kennedy. As it turned out, the lack of grass-roots organization spared our nation the blood letting and caused the process to shift over and to run its horrible course in Vietnam and, as Gary Aguilar points out, in South and Central America.

If one is a patriot such as Prouty, this sparing of domestic turmoil was a fortunate outcome. Prouty sees the Warren Report's accomplishment as: "it did serve to get this country through a trying time." This outcome, did as John McCloy said it would do, protect our state from being viewed as a banana republic. But I see the Warren Report as having served the national security state by frontally attacking democracy both domestically and internationally.

I view any renegade explanation of the assassination which opposes an institutional theory of the killing as serving the same purpose of disguising the fact that we are helpless so long as we remind blind to the true nature of the JFK killing. Our failure to come to grips with the simple truth of the assassination causes every President to know as a bottom line that he cannot without risking his life take exception to the workings of the national security state and covert intelligence operations under its aegis.

Therefore, we continue to be a non-banana republic only so long as the President recognizes his subordinate place which is not in accordance with the constitution. Should he get out of line, such a Kennedy did, then we will have another frontal attack on our democracy. This will not happen with a 10,000 Dow. If we have a 7,000 Dow and a recession, and the choice is between funding the national security state or attending to the needs of the people here and around the world, then knowing the truth about the Kennedy assassination may become a life and death matter.

VS (3/9/2000)

Mike, I have reason to think the psychiatrist is dead. His name is Harold Lief. He shared with me his view of the assassination. So far as I could learn it did not differ from mine. He was a nationally known and respected psychiatrist. His decency and openness made it inconceivable to me that he was working for the CIA.

I have not warred in back channel or front channel accusing any of our group of being CIA agents. I have stated in front channel that no member of our group is an agent. No one will come up with a single written refutation of that statement. If anyone can come up with a back-channel written communication to that effect I have begged you to do so. Furthermore, I have stated that, if you fail to do so, you are going to be viewed as having assented that there never was such a communication.

One person is accusing me of having called that person a CIA agent in a telephone conversation. I have about a two-inch thick correspondence with this person. I ask that person's permission to send every scrap of communication to each member of the group. I will gladly do so. You would then be able to judge for yourselves what I told that person.

I have accused certain people of being agents. How could I deny that? Jim Garrison in his *Trail of the Assassins* makes extensive reference to my exposure of Bill Boxley as a CIA agent. The person who is now attacking me became upset when I cautioned that person about working with William Turner. Well, William Turner was the coauthor with Boxley of the memorandum which was designed to have destroyed Garrison. After seeing Turner's work, and learning he was coming to Philadelphia, I invited him to come to my home where I would show what I had which indicated he was working for the CIA. He never replied to my request.

I have since referred this group to Turner's more recent work wherein he is pushing the Mafia-renegade CIA killing of Kennedy. I have also referred you to Turner's close and continuing work with Warren Hinckle who had, as I demonstrated, great hatred for Garrison.

I have also accused Ira Einhorn of being a CIA agent. Ira and I did along with Tom Katen a piece criticizing Epstein's first book on the assassination. Ira edited down my fury with that book. I thought Epstein was an agent. I still believe it. I told Epstein in Boston that he had gone over. He did not deny it.

I have accused Josiah Thompson of being a CIA agent. Josiah Thompson wanted to write *Six Seconds in Dallas* with me. In our first conference on the book he advised me that the Kennedy neck wound was the result of a particle of bone exiting the neck from a head wound. I shook Thompson's hand and bid him adieu. After the book was published, I invited him to my home for a gathering. I pointed out my outrage regarding his last paragraph when he asked what the book proved. His answer was that it did not prove a conspiracy but proved that the Warren Commission had brushed certain things under the rug. One of our former group members accused Thompson of being a CIA agent. I joined with him by writing my agreement with that proposition to Thompson. John Thomas was equally outraged when at a conference on the assassination Thompson identified himself as an agnostic. Thomas argued to Thompson that his book proved a conspiracy.

Do you recognize the similarity to the Newman book which proves that Oswald was a CIA agent and then instructs you that you cannot so conclude? Five years later Newman stated that it is crazy to think of the assassination as the work of a high level CIA plot. Rather, he embraces a renegade theory.

Mike, do you see now why my going after Turner and Newman was something more than "fly swatting"? I wanted very much to be able to support your view that the Jowers case was proof of high-level U.S. governmental conspiracy. But as a lawyer who knew the problems in the case, I could not bring myself honestly to do so. Do I believe that the CIA as an institution killed Martin Luther King? You bet I do! And do I believe that the national security state approved of the killing? You bet I do!

In my speech in Dallas I stated that we had to accept that a number of the critics were CIA agents. Who can dispute that? I have always conducted my work in the Kennedy assassination openly. I have always shared what I know with anyone who wanted the material. I have never copyrighted anything I wrote. I have worked without

attending to the need for security for my work or my person. I have never accused by phone or by written communication any of the group members as being CIA agents. I have turned over my correspondence on this case through the years to John Kelin without any censorship. John, if you have anything which looks like sickness in this area, I instruct you to share it with our group.

Yes, I truly love every member of the group in the sense that Erich Fromm articulates love. Those of you whom I have harmed by admiring your intelligence and by expressing love for you, please speak up. Your silence will be deemed assent that there is no harm.

Have I alienated everyone in the group other than Mike? If I have alienated you, please speak up. Since John Thomas will not address me and is clearly alienated from me, I exempt him from speaking on this issue. It is quite plain; I have alienated him. That is not to say that he has alienated me. He has not. I continue to love him.

MM (3/10/2000)

I fully understand the inevitability of discovering agents, and I am grateful to you for pointing out what you have discovered. What kind of sense would it make to suspect people, for good reasons, and then not say so? That would amount to joining them.

Vince, you have not alienated me. We have reached a certain level of understanding, and it will take a lot, from my point of view at least, to undo that, and I don't think it will happen. I trust myself (who else is there?) and my ability to evaluate someone's words, even if they are only words, and to make judgments based on those words. We have been talking a long time. If I cannot make some fundamental judgments about you after all that, we might as well give up the use of language as a medium of human communication, in which case we are not human anyway.

My opinion of you, Vince, is that you are truly honest, truly loving, and despite your vociferous denials, extraordinarily intelligent. I don't mean Phi Beta Kappa intelligence (though apparently you have that, too, which I don't), I mean the intelligence of a modern-day peasant who understands reality, his situation, and the importance of being a human being.

Now, how can the intelligence of a peasant be extraordinary? Shall we leave that to the nobility (which includes, today, the would-be nobility, i.e. the great majority of the population) to figure out for themselves? They never will, of course. How can a Chomsky understand that a Salandria is more intelligent than he is? How can you understand something that is at a higher level of understanding than you have reached? (Yes, I believe intelligence can be improved, though I admit I see very little evidence of it.) It would be like me trying to understand the theory of relativity.

That's where love comes into it. No, you are not Jesus Christ, and yes, you can be arrogant and condescending (not often, but it happens), but you are clearly attempting to practice what Erich Fromm preached (and may have practiced, too, for all I know). I do not accept you as an authority on love, nor do I think you are trying to be one, but you are trying to be a loving person. What more can one human being expect of another than that?

MM (3/10/99)

In terms of scientific knowledge, I too, Vince, am at idiot level on the AIDS origin question. But don't you see the parallel? AIDS is to us what JFK is to other people. They think of that as extremely complicated and loaded with details it would take three

lifetimes to understand. And you know that this is part of the strategy to keep us confused.

Knowing that, we can ask the same question you ask about JFK: If the government were innocent, they would prove it. For example, nobody has ever offered to do any experiments to test the artificial origin theory. This would be a simple thing to do (for the government). Put the scientists in a room with VISNA and bovine and whatever viruses and see if they can make HIV. If they can make it now, then the next question is when they could have made it before. Now, if the answers to those questions, which you would assume to be questions of science that are answerable, are "yes" and "since ca. 1978," then it's not hard to understand why precisely these questions are not answered. Once you admit it could have been done, the next question is, Was it? I don't think the culprits want a lot of people falling into that logical sequence of thought.

It's very similar to the Vietnam withdrawal situation. If–despite Chomsky–you admit what for most other people is obvious, that Vietnam policy was reversed immediately after the assassination, you MUST ask if there was a connection (or be rightly identified as an idiot). If you admit that HIV can be made in a laboratory now, you MUST ask when it was possible before, and then you MUST ask if they did it (since they could have).

I went round and round on that question years ago, fencing through all the objections–like the meaning of the word "make" etc., but no one gave a reasonable answer. I asked Tom Keske recently, as I guess you read, and there still seems to be no reasonable to that question.

I'm sure that Tom and Vincent [Gammill], who are much more versed in the details than I am (I'm not at all), can summarize similar questions that should have been answered, and other things that may not prove anything conclusively, but at least prove what I believe, namely:

1) There is strong evidence to support the suspicion that (note the qualification) HIV was artificially created.

Given 1), 2) is justified:

2) There is strong evidence to support the suspicion that the US government did it, or contracted it out for someone to do.

Given 2), 3) is justified:

3) There is strong evidence to support the suspicion that the US government did it to counter the national security threat posed by overpopulation in the Third World, and that gays were also specifically targeted (blacks, too?).

Now, these are three separate and distinct propositions. I tried to caution Ed Graves to keep them separate when he was suing the government, but I guess within the bounds of that suit it wouldn't have made much difference.

MM (3/11/2000)

This story of Ellen Ray fascinates me. I think this is extremely important. Why haven't you mentioned this before? I have mentioned my doubts about Ellen Ray and Bill Schaap, who are close to Chomsky, a number of times.

If Ray is an agent, this is a major development, and explains a lot–rather, confirms a lot of what I have long suspected. A very juicy bite to chew on.

May I help you in my request for more details?

Why did she and Turner visit you in 1969? Who was the other man? Did Turner say he was a multimillionaire and wanted Garrison to run for president? Did they explain how they got that idea?

Did you ever meet Turner after that? Talk about it? Did he have an explanation?

How do you imagine Ray got hold of your mail to Garrison?

What does this mean: "But when I learned who she was years later, and knew what her work was, I considered her a true heroine." Is she an agent, then, or a "heroine"? No comprendo.

Did they actually give Garrison $3,000 to run for president? What do you think was the purpose of this maneuver?

When Ray called you, did she offer any explanation as to what she was doing in 1969, or how she got hold of your letter to Garrison?

VS (3/14/2000)

Ralph, thank you for your post of 12:45 AM 3/14/2000 regarding Richard Sprague. My memory is refreshed by what you set forth in this post. It is now quite clear to me that I publicly stated that I saw Sprague as an agent. I drew this conclusion about him because I believed that he had convinced Jim Garrison to go after Bradley, and because I thought that the photographic research was an ineffective way of stating the simple truth of the Kennedy conspiracy. You state that I was wrong in both conclusions. Since I trust your judgment, I readily admit that I was most probably wrong in my conclusion that he was an agent.

I am now certain that I publicly called Richard Sprague an agent. Therefore I have misinformed the group on this score. I urge you to repost your 3/14/00 transmission to the group. If you do not, I will excerpt the part dealing with Sprague and do so myself.

VS (3/14/2000)

Mike, Turner, Ellen Ray, and another man whose name I do not know visited me at the request of Jim Garrison in 1969. Jim asked me to evaluate their proposal. The man other than Garrison was identified as a multi-millionaire. They did not explain how they got the idea. But the unidentifiable man stated that he wanted Garrison to run for President. I never met Turner again. There was no discussion of that meeting except for a call from Jim Garrison a few weeks later when he stated that he had received $3,000.00 from the guy. I do not know whether the money was given for Jim to run for president or for some other purpose.

I think the aim of the maneuver was to destroy Jim's credibility. I told Jim that.

When Ellen Ray called in the early 90's, she did not offer any explanation of why she was with the other two back around 1969. I did not ask her.

She told me during our telephone conversation how she met Oliver Stone in an elevator. She then told about *On the Trail of the Assassins*. She then sent him the book. This is what started his interest in producing *JFK*. That is why I described her as a heroine.

How did she get my letter to Jim? She was seeing him, I gathered, rather frequently. At that time he was terribly ill. His heart was in sad shape. He could not answer his mail. I gathered that Jim gave her my letter for reply from her.

Mike, I am confident that any person who was responsible for getting *JFK* started could not be an agent. I had asked her to publish the correspondents who I thought had important things to say about the JFK killing. She never answered my request. But that

does not make her an agent. She and her husband never had much in the way of financial resources. One does not do one's publishing assets any good by proposing that the national security state killed Kennedy. I can understand her reluctance not to pursue the assassination matter after her very significant contributions.

Nor do I think that Noam Chomsky is an agent. I think that Professor Chomsky values enjoying considerable access to our media. I believe that he sees himself as doing substantial good by availing himself of that access and discoursing on globalization and other important issues. Therefore, I believe that he refuses to use his very considerable brain power to come to a conscious conclusion on the assassination which if publicly proclaimed will bring the heavens down on him and cause him to be denied future access. He called my 1998 Dallas presentation lucid. He has never called me seriously mentally disturbed, as someone in our group has. How can we conclude that no one in our group is an agent, and at the same time conclude that Chomsky is one?

As you can see, calling someone an agent without having convincing evidence can cause trouble. I think it is fair to describe someone as helping to cooperate with the assassins, albeit unintentionally.

I have taken the point of view that the U.S. national security state was institutionally involved in the JFK assassination. Suppose I am wrong? Let us posit that the U.S. national security state was not institutionally involved, but some renegade elements killed Kennedy without involving the center of U.S. Cold War power. Then, by believing and espousing my point of view I would be unwittingly helping the assassins. I would expect each of you, not back channel, but up front, to tell me so. I would not cut you off from discussion with me for making your arguments. I would merely ask you to address my arguments and defeat my evidence and logic. If you were able to convince me that I was wrong, I would welcome the recognition of this point of view as truth. I would then be able to enjoy my country, my wealth, my profession, and my privileges without guilt.

Back again, Mike, to cautioning you about being careful about calling someone an agent. This is not because I feel that agents don't abound in this work. They do. But I am cautioning you that by so doing carelessly, you will provide a mechanism for people to isolate you completely and to attack you and to seek to discredit the work you do.

That is not to say that we should be silent when a person like John Newman piles tons of evidence on us to the effect that Oswald was a CIA agent, and then instructs us that we cannot conclude therefrom that Oswald was a CIA agent. We should in such a case have the courage to call Oswald a CIA agent which he was. We should have the courage to bring John Newman to task for failing to concede that Oswald was, and instructing us that we could not conclude from the mountain of evidence which he and others uncovered that Oswald was a CIA agent.

If we are careful about our charges and can back them up with evidence and logical argument, we should then not worry about the effect such an attack on Newman's view will have on our reputations. When Marty spoke in Dallas, Josiah Thompson called him "nuts." Whereupon I immediately stated, "I plead guilty to being crazy." Marty was not nuts. His speech set forth simple truth.

This self-evident truth we are selling is a hard sell. If one is not willing in the interests of truth to be separated from the herd, separated from media access, separated from most of a tiny group of correspondents, and left alone preaching to a non-existent

choir, then you do not belong in this discussion. Ralph, Gaeton, Marty, you and I are willing. Who else is willing to join?

MM (3/15/2000)

Vince, the following two statements are incompatible:

I think the aim of the maneuver was to destroy Jim's credibility.

I am confident that any person who was responsible for getting *JFK* started could not be an agent.

John Newman was heavily involved in *JFK*. Time Warner was the producer. Are they "heroes," like Ellen Ray?

Turner, Ray, Chomsky and Newman are still alive. We should be talking with them, not about them. I suggest we do that.

I did it with Chomsky, at length, and your conclusion, along with mine and that of everyone else in this group, was that he was a liar. You said you thought he had been "assigned" to me. You apparently changed your mind because he said your speech was "lucid," although even Marty told you that all this means is that what you said is clearly understandable. Then you said you would not communicate with him again. Marty said forget Chomsky. Joan said forget Chomsky. Ralph said (I think) forget Chomsky.

Well, if we're going to forget Chomsky, then we should forget the rest of them. But you say that Newman is more important than Chomsky because he is the media darling. Are you going to abandon your challenge to him because Jim DiEugenio got mad? Why did he refuse to publish your piece on Newman because of your remark about Garrison? The two things have nothing to do with each other.

Let me suggest a different approach. I suggest we judge people by their willingness to communicate. I tested Chomsky's willingness to communicate, and you saw the result. I tested Newman's willingness to communicate, and you saw the result. I tested the governing board of COPA's willingness to communicate, and you saw the result. I tested Michael Parenti's willingness to communicate, and you saw the result.

You have presented another challenge to Newman. I'm sure he has seen it. Again he is showing his willingness to communicate.

For the "action-oriented" among us:

Step 1: Get all the e-mail addresses. Ray can be reached at caq@igc.org. Don't know about the others but I'm not going to bother unless others in this group show interest and help.

Step 2: Write to them concerning our questions and suspicions. Circulate the draft of the letter to the group. Everyone makes suggestions, or adds a comment. All of us sign the letter. This will make it more likely to receive a reply.

Then we take it from there. If discussion is possible, it will happen. If it is not, it won't. In either case, I prefer to base my judgments on the behavior of the people that we approach. If the discussion breaks down, or never gets started, we will all see it, and be able to make up our own minds about why.

VS (3/15/2000)

Mike, Ellen Ray got the movie *JFK* "started." Newman did not. Therefore, Newman is not a hero. For this deed, Ellen is in my judgment a "heroine."

I have tried to talk to Turner. He never responded to my request that he discuss with me why I think he was an agent. This was in the context of his having co-authored a memorandum with Jim Boxley that if Jim Garrison had acted on it, would have caused

his destruction. I, like you, have an extensive correspondence with Chomsky. It was clear to me from that correspondence that he was not interested in learning the truth about the JFK assassination. He quit the correspondence. I did not. I slipped my 1998 Dallas speech to him for his negative criticism only. He had no negative criticism. He called it lucid. That was more than I ever expected to get from him. So, I promised him that I would not engage him on the JFK assassination subject again. I like to keep my promises.

I did ask Ellen Ray to publish the material of our committee members. She never replied. That was clear evidence to me that she no longer had any interest. At one point she had enormous interest.

I have asked DiEugenio to give my rough review of Newman's book, *Oswald and the CIA*, to Newman. I urged him to have Newman communicate with me. I offered to call off John Kelin's publication so that the discussion could occur. I agreed to apologize, if Newman could explain my problems with the conclusion of his book that the reader should not conclude from the material that Oswald was a CIA agent and with Newman's assertion that a high-level conspiracy to kill Kennedy was "crazy." So far, I have heard nothing in response. Am I going to abandon my challenge to Newman because DiEugenio was angered? Of course not.

The only negative remark about Garrison I ever made was that he gave me some reason to think that he might have temporarily softened his view about CIA involvement because of an advance on his book *The Star Spangled Contract*. But I retracted that immediately when Joan Mellen told me about Ralph Schoenman's involvement in getting that book published. I sent all of you a copy of the comment that Jim Garrison made in the copy of *The Star Spangled Contract* which he sent me. He wrote: "April 1976 For Vince Salandria–My old friend and mentor–Jim Garrison."

Now, does that not demonstrate that he and I were as one on our knowledge that the CIA as an institution killed Kennedy? "Mentor" is defined in my dictionary as" "1. a wise and trusted counselor or teacher; 2. an influential senior sponsor or supporter." When I made that remark to the group, I was trying to explain that if in fact at that time Jim Garrison told Tom Snyder that he did not feel that the CIA as an institution killed Kennedy, that he was not being serious. I have always contended that Jim Garrison and I have had the same model of explanation of the conspiracy to kill Kennedy. If Jim DiEugenio said that he would not involve himself with me because of that remark, I am confident that he will be reassured by this explanation. Whoever among you heard this from him, should repost this commentary to him.

Mike, I am in favor of approaching Newman and Turner in the manner you suggest, because they are actively involved in espousing points of view which are different from ours on the assassination. But it is clear to me that Noam Chomsky and Ellen Ray are not interested at this time in discussing the Kennedy assassination with us. I consider Newman and Turner in a different category from Chomsky and Ray, because Chomsky and Ray are not now saying a word on the assassination, and I believe that they are entitled to their privacy with respect to their need for silence.

As for your asking every member of the group to submit an assessment of my 1998 COPA speech, I most heartily endorse this request of yours. With respect to excluding them from the mailing list, I would not do so. But I certainly would view their failure to comment on the speech as their unarticulated refusal to accept its conclusions. Most of them have accepted my services as their clerk mailing them over the course of

years an enormous amount of material. They are still purporting to be vitally interested in, and some are actively working in this area, and this distinguishes them from Chomsky and Ray.

I would exclude Gaeton, Marty, Ralph and you from commenting on the speech, because you have done so and favorably. I would request that Joan Mellen, who praised the speech profusely, because of the problems we have had of late, should comment only if she has changed her view. Absence of comment from her will be interpreted as her standing by her written opinion.

Thank you, Mike, for your continued thinking and working in the interests of this group.

VS (3/15/2000)

Re the question of "mental illness" which has come up, I must urge upon you that anyone who has been in this work for a number of years and is not alert to government agents playing the role of assassination critics or government agents infiltrating critics and their work is at best naive. Also, any serious worker in this area who does not worry about the possibility of some honest critics becoming either government agents or persons who cooperate with the government is, I submit, likewise at best naive.

I concede that detecting government agents is sometimes difficult, and therefore mistakes are made. This does not demonstrate that the person who is mistaken is ipso facto proven to be mentally ill.

Ralph Brown is of the opinion that I was dead wrong about Richard Sprague. I would ask Ralph to share with the group my full correspondence with him about Sprague. So, all of us can see if and why I went wrong. Perhaps we can learn from this.

As you know, the American press described Jim Garrison in a manner which would tend to have people conceive of him as mentally disturbed. This, as you well know, was a weapon the press used to discount the truths that Jim Garrison was espousing. As you also know, Joe McGinniss, in a Jan. 1967 column in the *Philadelphia Inquirer* declared my ideas "crazy and horrible." Here is why he concluded I had crazy ideas:

This is Vincent Salandria's theory. It is crazy and horrible and when he talks about it you can't help but think that maybe he has been working too hard.

"No, he said, "I'm not a nut. One of my great strengths is that I know myself very well and I know I'm not a nut. I arrived at this scientifically. It's not crazy. It makes a lot of sense.

"The Kennedys know all about it. (See *One Hell of a Gamble: Khrushchev, Castro & Kennedy 1958-1964*, Aleksandr Fursenko and Timothy Naftali, pp. 344-346, which reveals that Robert Kennedy sent an emissary, William Walton, to advise the Soviets about the assassination conspiracy.) They were getting ready to expose the whole thing, then somebody made a deal. Somebody told them that Johnson would step down in '68 and Bobby could move right in."

Vincent Salandria looked very sad when he talked about this part. "The Kennedys should never have done it," he said. "They should realize that these men won't give up their power. Sure, Johnson will step down and Bobby will move in but how long will he stay?

"This was a bad deal. They'll get Bobby killed and they'll get us all killed. Those people in power want to bring us right into China. They keep building up the Army every year. They're turning this into a closed, totalitarian, military society.

"The assassination was just the start. We have to worry about what's going on now. It doesn't matter who the actual assassins were. We have to get at the people in charge. They're the ones we have to expose."

And the sad part was that Vincent Salandria really believed in everything he said.

For being so prescient, I was declared crazy. That is why I ask you to consider how destructive such statements are.

Now whether a person is an agent or not is very important and should occupy some of our attention. And whether a person has crossed over and is serving the government or cooperating with it is also important. You know from your research that the U.S. government infiltrated Garrison's office in a very major way. Do you really think that Bill Boxley was anything other than a CIA agent? Then how do you attribute innocence to Bill Turner, who worked with Boxley on a memo which, if acted upon by Garrison, would have caused his demise? How do you attribute innocence to Bill Turner co-authoring a book with Warren Hinckle which concludes that some low level renegade conspiracy was responsible for the killing of Kennedy? How do you view my questioning his bona fides as symptomatic of my mental illness?

Has the government sent government agents to me to destroy my reputation and to discredit my work? Jim DiEugenio spoke of this in *Destiny Betrayed*. On page 363 he stated:

Garrison was not the first Warren Report critic to be infiltrated by the government. In late 1965, Vincent Salandria, a prominent critic and Philadelphia attorney, encountered a woman named Rita Rollins, who said she was a nurse from a wealthy family in Texas and New Orleans. She said this family had a ranch in Texas on which they had practiced "dry runs" of the assassination. She told him she had searched him out because of his reputation as a leading critic of the Report, and she wanted him to go to Canada with her, where she would produce witnesses. [She offered me $12,000.00.]

Salandria asked her many specific questions about the assassination, and she had answers for them all. He called another serious critic and researcher, Sylvia Meagher, who came down from New York. They both questioned the woman, and her responses held up. As Salandria was driving Meagher to the train station, she suggested one more round of queries. This time she asked Rollins questions about her occupation, nursing. Rollins was stymied. Her cover was blown.

Six months later, Salandria found out that the woman's real name was Lulu Belle Holmes and she was an FBI agent who had successfully infiltrated the Peace Movement. The story she was trying to sell Salandria was that Hoover and LBJ had killed Kennedy. The point was presumably to try to make Salandria look silly by having the "witnesses" recant or be exposed as unreliable. The Agency was not alone in their campaign against the critics. –Author interview with Vincent Salandria, February 23, 1992.

My guess is that the government sent far more agents into my life than I ever detected. I have told you about Josiah Thompson's efforts to join me as a co-author of *Six Seconds in Dallas*. Was that not an effort to provide an easy cross-over path for me? Professor Jacob Cohen of Brandeis suggested that he could have me published in all of the major magazines of the country. Was that not an effort to arrange my cross-over?

Would I have actually fully known that I had crossed over? If I did not want to know, I could deny it to myself. I could have conceived of myself merely as accommodating slightly to editorial needs of the media who would be opened up for me. But you can be sure that I could never again have spoken of the warfare state's institutions as killing Kennedy without losing my access and perquisites.

Speaking of institutions and institutional guilt, at the certain risk of offending some of you, I came across the following in today's *Philadelphia Inquirer,* p. A 19:

Was Pope's Apology Sufficient? by Kenneth A Briggs

Making amends began at Vatican II, at which Catholics were presented with a bold new theology that condemned anti-Semitism and rejected efforts to convert Jews. Judaism was accepted as legitimate on its own terms, a covenant sealed between God and Moses. That landmark teaching implicitly acknowledged that something had been wrong in the church's conduct toward Jews. Still, the need for fuller self-exploration was obvious.

That step, however, brings the church smack up against its lingering definition of itself as the "perfect society." As expressed at Vatican I in the 19th century, this meant simply that the church in its essence could do no wrong. There we have the problem.

As Rome tries to reposition itself in history, it instinctively balks at admitting wrongs. Sincere as the remorse may be, it becomes impossible without pointing fingers at the causes, personal and institutional.

Instead, the voice that has emerged resembles that of the police commissioner allowing that abuses have been dealt to the African American community by certain errant officers but leaving details aside. The problem is always the renegades, not the brass.

Being sorry for such sins without content wouldn't work well in the confessional, either. Imagine someone who had endured an abortion asking the confessor to forgive all those who had obtained an abortion but never mentioning her own.

Of course Briggs is dealing with an imperfect analogy of religion to government. It may be posited as a matter of theology that the institution of the Catholic Church is a divine creation of a perfect society. Therefore, contrary to Briggs' view, the Catholic church consistent with its concept of divine perfection, can deny institutional guilt and blame the guilt on its followers who were ill informed or even evil.

But with respect to governments, we no longer accept a divine right of kings. Every government is the imperfect creature of imperfect humankind. We did not agree with the Nazi war criminals whose defense was that states cannot be guilty of crimes. Therefore, we must factor into the guilt in the murder of Kennedy the institutions of our national security state, which by mission and structure were created to conduct the Cold War using means which were both overt and covert and necessarily undemocratic. If by so doing we will be declared delusional or seriously mentally ill, so be it.

Let us continue our discussions, but now more openly. Let us not go behind one another's backs to make charges. We must be open to self criticism and the criticism of others. But let us while we seek to dig hard and deeply into the truth, maintain respect and love for those with whom we disagree.

MM (3/16/2000)

This is a letter I sent (twice) to Ellen Ray of Covert Action Quarterly*; it remained unanswered.*

Dear Ellen Ray,

I am told by Vincent Salandria that you visited him in 1969, along with William Turner and another man, in order to get him to help you convince Jim Garrison to run for president. Salandria writes (3/14/2000):

Turner, Ellen Ray, and another man whose name I do not know visited me at the request of Jim Garrison in 1969. Jim asked me to evaluate their proposal. The man other than Garrison was identified as a multi-millionaire. They did not explain how they got the idea. But the unidentifiable man stated that he wanted Garrison to run for President. I never met Turner again. There was no discussion of that meeting except for a call from Jim Garrison a few weeks later when he stated that he had received $3,000.00 from the guy. I do not know whether the money was given for Jim to run for president or for some other purpose.

I think the aim of the maneuver was to destroy Jim's credibility. I told Jim that.

When Ellen Ray called in the early 90's, she did not offer any explanation of why she was with the other two back around 1969. I did not ask her.

I'm sure that you will understand that I (and others) are curious about this. Any comments you would like to make will be greatly appreciated.

VS (3/16/2000)

Mike, my correspondence with Chomsky in my opinion is of no public interest. It does not speak to Chomsky operating at the level of his intelligence. He asked me not to share his letters with anyone. I have agreed to do so. I will honor my promise.

I feel that Ellen Ray is entitled to privacy, because she has served this cause very well. If she wishes to retire from it, for any reason, I feel that is her right. I will not intrude on her.

MM (3/17/2000)

I do not feel that Ellen Ray is entitled to any privacy regarding JFK or the CIA. She has been heavily and publicly involved, and still is. She publishes a magazine which purports to expose the misdeeds of the CIA, she published Garrison, and she supported the Stone film. Then she dropped it all like a hot potato and retreated into CAQ's "hands-off-the-assassinations" policy, which is compatible with Chomsky, a major influence with them. Chomsky deserves no privacy on this either.

These are public figures, Vince, important ones. They influence thousands of people. I know many people, influential in their own right, who believe and trust in every word that comes out of Chomsky's mouth. I used to be one myself. I used to feel that way about CAQ, too, until I saw what I now think is their dishonest approach to the AIDS issue as well as the assassinations.

What is going on, here, Vince? This is extremely important. We need to try and find out what is going on in these people's minds. Is it fear? Is it some sort of compromise with the enemy they have accepted? On what terms? Ray and Chomsky are people that must be on our side. If they are not on our side, nobody is. I am not particularly curious about Turner and Newman. Ex-FBI and NSA, Christ, we know the mentality. Their religion ("America") explains everything about them. We have people in this group who have exactly the same religion, and we have seen that it is virtually impossible to get them to see beyond it. It doesn't matter whether Turner and Newman are "agents." They are devotees of the religion, always have been and always will be. All we will ever get

from pressuring them or trying to engage them in rational discourse is the same thing we have gotten from certain members of this group.

Now, that may be true of Ray and Chomsky et al., too, but if it is, it is very well disguised (except for occasional remarks by Chomsky like "America is still the freest country in the world" and his admission of friendship with ex-CIA director Deutsch). Do you really think they deserve privacy in this respect? We are not talking about their person or their personal lives. We are talking about their publications.

Furthermore, you are only speculating about their possible wish for "privacy." They themselves have expressed nothing of the sort (except Chomsky's request that you and I not publish his letters).

I believe we are correct in trying to engage Newman and Turner in dialogue, but we would be more correct in going after Chomsky, Ray, Parenti, Zinn, Cockburn (although I don't even read *The Nation* anymore), etc. These are the people most likely to agree with us (though they don't), and the people we are most likely to learn something from by involving them in dialogue. We are not going to learn anything from Newman (or Turner either, probably) except that if you scratch deep enough, you will find a patriot, exactly like millions of other patriots. What can we learn from that? I am perfectly familiar with that mentality, and so are you. Every American is. It is of no interest at all.

It is Ray and Chomsky et al. that are posing as the rational ones, the patriots of conscience (in Thoreau's sense), and as the more scholarly, respected, reliable, and humane commentators. If anyone should be able to listen to and respond to our arguments, it is they. To simply let them off the hook by saying they are entitled to their privacy makes no sense at all. I do not agree with you or understand you on this point.

Vince, you qualify as a radical leftist dissident. So does Marty and so do I, and I think so does Ralph. Chomsky, Ray, Parenti, Zinn et al. are the leading radical leftist dissidents. They are our proper addressees.

I have no idea where the other people in this group stand. Perhaps they have no idea themselves, or perhaps they want to keep their "privacy." Perhaps they want to keep their privacy regarding your COPA speech, despite both your and my plea that each one of them say something about it.

But when you enter upon a public dialogue, either through publications or in a group such as this one, you take on a certain public responsibility. I have no respect for those who say nothing. If they do not wish to participate, they should drop out of the group. They do not have a right to privacy if they want to be part of a public forum and the exchange of ideas. There is no such thing as a one-sided exchange of ideas.

I think we should try to expand the group, get rid of the deadwood, and start talking with people that are more compatible. The dissident AIDS researchers are one such group, and I think it is clear that people like Vincent Gammill and Tom Keske have the same orientation as we do, or similar. It is also clear that the entire group of "radical leftist dissidents" led by people like Chomsky, Parenti, Zinn, Ray, etc. are the people that we should be talking to. We are much more likely to make progress there than with people like Newman and Turner–though as I said, I'm all for "dialogue" with them too (although it hasn't been one at all so far).

I have asked for Newman's and Turner's e-mail addresses. I know somebody on this list either has them or could get them more easily than I, but it doesn't happen. What

does this mean? It means they do not want the dialogue to take place. We are wasting our time with them, Vince.

Vince, re-reading this, I see the tone may appear harsher than I mean it. My affection and respect for you remain undiminished. I don't mean to be harsh. You are the only person on this list that I can really call a friend, because I feel we have gotten to know each other well enough to say that. If I sound harsh, it's just because I feel we are close enough and understand each other well enough that I can say what's on my mind without worrying too much about being harsh.

VS (3/17/2000)

Mike, your tone does not strike me as harsh at all. Rather it strikes me as honest. Sometimes we (I am certainly included in this category) see as harshness plainly stated truths which we are unprepared to accept.

I am complimented by your feeling of friendship with me. I consider you an important friend. But, I must say that I also consider several of the other correspondents important friends whom I deeply love.

MM (3/18/2000)

What strikes me most about the Mellen-Schotz exchange is the truth of the following:

The full truth of the Kennedy assassination as we know it can only be accepted by people whose thinking is "marginal," i.e. is centered on values and truth which is far from the governing values in our society. Indeed I discussed this matter in my paper in Dallas last November. In that paper I tried to explain how one of the defenses to be expected by people intent on denying to themselves the full truth as we know it was to call people who voiced it crazy.

The thought itself is not complicated or difficult to understand; the difficulty is in applying it to yourself. In fact, I guess it's not only difficult but impossible. Someone who shows this syndrome (denial) is by definition incapable of admitting to himself that he is in denial. What results is hysteria. I won't try to define that word because more words will just get me in trouble, but I would say the word applies as a description of the following:

1. Chomsky's reaction to my persistence on the withdrawal question (documented).
2. John's reaction to Vince's persistence on the "institutional" question.
3. Joan's reaction to Vince's persistence on the question of "collaboration."

Let's put it this way: it's getting on your high horse and galloping away. The high-horse-rider doesn't realize it, of course, but what she (generic feminine!) is galloping away from is a truth she does not want to accept as such, and where she is galloping away to is safety. Safety is a place where you don't have to deal with the truth that has threatened you. The high horse is the exaggerated sense of indignation, of feeling insulted and having had their personal integrity attacked. Everyone is entitled to a certain degree of defensiveness, but the key word here is "exaggerated." It applies to all three cases above.

The truth that has threatened Chomsky, John, and Joan is one and the same. It is summarized in Vince's COPA speech. (The withdrawal issue leads directly to the assassination, which in turn leads to Vince's conclusions, and Chomsky knows this; that's why he became hysterical on the withdrawal issue.)

An interesting aspect of the denial syndrome is that the initial reaction to the threat of truth is often one of relief and approbation. Hence the standing ovation Vince received for his speech, John's and Joan's praise of it, and even Chomsky's "lucid." Put almost any one of those applauding people in John or Joan's position, however, where they are asked to carry on an extended dialogue dealing with this truth, and they would eventually react the same way. In other words, the need for denial would eventually overtake their initial gut reaction. Once they "thought" about it, they would most likely come to the conclusion that they don't agree with or approve of it at all!

Vince and Marty have not witnessed this reaction from me because I had already come, independently, to the same conclusions they had before I started talking with them. I share their horror vision. I think we will find that Tom Keske and Vincent Gammill do as well, though they came to it through the AIDS issue. Actually, I think there are a great many people out there who share it, but it is diffused in multitudinous sub-issues.

Vince's description–which as he says is basically common sense–of what happened in 1963, and of where we are now–is a complete picture, encompassing ALL of the sub-issues. (Vincent G. and Tom, are you listening?) This is why it is so threatening.

Re the "agent" question, consider this. If Turner and Newman, for example, are agents, does that make them the devil incarnate? No, it makes them employees of the US government. I have been an employee of the US government. Some members of my family spent their lives working for the US government. Therefore, if one expresses serious indignation at being called an agent of the US government, what he is also revealing is the intensity of his antagonism towards the US government.

MM (3/19/2000)

Owen, I want to answer your letter in more detail, and I assume you won't mind if I quote from it and share it with the group.

I have tried to offer my knowledge and efforts to represent Fletcher's point of view to this group.

I appreciate that. It would be better of course to have Fletch himself participating, but since his health does not permit it, a stand-in is ok! However, precisely because Fletch cannot speak for himself, it would be better for all concerned (including you) if you spoke more for yourself first, and only secondarily for Fletch. You know his work so well, and he has written so much, that you probably would not have to "represent" him at all, beyond quoting appropriately from his work.

Most of the stuff we are talking about goes beyond the point we were able to reach with Fletch before our correspondence with him was interrupted. Precisely this business about "the whole CIA" or not, as I've said, we only just started to talk about with Fletch. This is new territory. I don't think it is fair to him, you, or us, for you to try to interpret or predict what his responses would be if he were in your place, writing to us. The writer, who is in this case you, not Fletch, must undergo a give-and-take process, a learning process where everybody learns from each other, for this to be productive. Fletch unfortunately is simply not involved in this. You are, and that's fine. But when we write to you, we are writing to you, not to Fletch.

The reason I may "not be compatible" is that in my opinion the leader, Vince, has his head in the sand regarding any more information to the truth of the assassination. Yes more information is what will lead to the truth. Not my view, but the truth.

I don't agree. First of all, I don't like the notion of "leadership." I think it was the anthropologist Desmond Morris who said men were extremely conformist creatures who like to build hierarchies and fit into them, hence the attraction of the military, uniforms, etc., whereas women are more egalitarian, i.e. less likely to require leadership in a group. If that is true I prefer the female way, though I'm not sure Morris is right about this.

What we have here I would call an experiment in anarchy. From 1993-99, Vince was the "leader," or "clerk," as he referred to himself, because it was he who physically collected our letters, copied them, and distributed them by snail mail. It was a lot of work, and because I think everyone respected that, he was the "leader" in that paper modus. He also refrained from saying very much. Now he is just another member of the group, and he likes it that way, as he has said, and so do I, because he has felt free to say a lot more.

Each of us is free to be the "leader." All you have to do is bring up a subject for discussion, present your point of view, and hope for a fruitful discussion. This is what has been happening. There has been no "leadership," and it's better this way. This is like a small unmoderated newsgroup. The advantage of being small is that we can dig into each other's heads more deeply. That is good, even though at times uncomfortable.

I think all of us welcome information. You are free to present whatever information you like. Please do so. However, we can react to that information according to our own lights. We can have different opinions as to the importance of information. Look at the difference between Vince and me on the importance of the Jowers trial.

If we disagree as to, "it is only the CIA, or not" fine. I could discuss further.

I believe this is the ONLY thing we have been disagreeing about. But it is important. And not "the CIA," but "the Secret Team," etc. There are at least three distinctions to be made: the government as a whole, the CIA (or intelligence establishment) as a whole, and the Secret Team = Gold Key Club. The High Cabal is another notion that may be distinguished. This is what we are talking about–these distinctions and their importance. And I repeat, this is virgin territory. Fletch did not get into this discussion, and we do not know how he would behave or what he would do if he were in it. I don't think you can speak for him in this area.

Your elephant analogy is one of the things I challenged, and you have not replied. I repeat: What is similar about an elephant and the CIA? Elephants do useful work in some cultures. They do not do the kind of things the CIA does. If you want to defend this analogy, you must tell us why this "elephant" is useful and why we need it, despite all the (fully documented and proven) evil things it does.

Owen, you're on your own here. Fletch can't help you. He has never addressed this issue, as far as I know. As I said, we just never got that far.

I would appreciate it very much if you would pass on all the information you have about AIDS to the group. I have never heard of Dave Emory. I think I have made my point of view on this clear. JFK and AIDS are the same issue. AIDS is much more complicated and difficult to follow, but we are fortunate to have Vincent Gammill and Tom Keske in the group, who can help a lot, and have. Have you read their posts? How does the information they have contributed jive with yours?

What gave you the idea that I "look up to Vince no matter what?" I have disagreed with him on several things. Yes, I have a great deal of respect for him, and I agree with most of what he says, but this is not blind adulation. It is simply the result of exchanging letters with him for the past 6 years.

I don't want to insult you, so I won't suggest that you idolize Fletch or would agree with him "no matter what," but you obviously think a lot of him. So do I. I keep saying this. I have great respect for Fletch Prouty. I do not think he is an intelligence agent. I think he has made a courageous and important contribution. What we are doing now builds on Fletch's work. Unfortunately he cannot be part of that, but his contribution is clear. Marty has always distrusted him, and I have attacked Marty for this, as I also attacked Marty for being too harsh with John Thomas. Perhaps he has been too harsh with you, too. But Marty is Marty. Marty is not Vince, and Marty is not me.

I don't agree that Vince is "just like any of us, no worse... no better." He would agree, but I don't. Fletch is not "just like any of us," either. Both are extraordinary individuals.

MM (3/20/2000)

Marty, there is nothing new in the Prouty material quoted by Thomas. As I told the group before, Prouty changed his mind on Bundy during his correspondence with me. His first theory was that Bundy was just "stupid." My belief is that Bundy convinced JFK to cancel the strikes, because he was in collusion with Bissell. Bissell and Cabell's behavior is the key to what happened in the Bay of Pigs, as I have shown in my publications. Why JFK did not fire Bundy I don't know, but the answer must be that Bundy is a good actor and was able to conceal his collusion with Bissell. I think it is obvious, too, that although JFK intuited a lot about what was going on before his execution, it was not all clear to him–and is there anything more natural than a person in his position indulging in a little wishful thinking, namely that maybe he still had some loyal allies on his side?

Finally a note to Owen Rogers which I have needed to make for some time on a related matter. Owen, repeatedly in your emails, you make reference to Lansdale's possible or probable involvement in the secret team or special ops or whatever it is called that was somehow involved in the JFK assassination. Yet at your website is a radio interview with Prouty in which Prouty says point blank and I am quoting him, "I know that they [Allen Dulles, Ed Lansdale, and Gen. Cabell] were not involved." Please note. Prouty doesn't say he doesn't believe they were involved, or that he has no information that they were involved. He says, "I know they were not involved." Owen, please clarify.

I too will be anxiously awaiting Owen's response to this, although as I told Owen in my last letter to him, I do not feel that Owen is competent to speak for Prouty on the questions we are asking now. Fletch is unfortunately, for all intents and purposes, no longer with us.

MM (3/20/2000)

Dear Marty and whoever else is interested,

I have just listened to the two Lex Coleman interviews at www.astridmm.com/prouty/archives.html.

At one point Prouty says that if the government had done it (killed JFK), there would have been a trial in Dallas. This did not happen because the new government, under Johnson, ordered Wagoner Carr not to have the trial.

Illogical. If the "old government" did it, there would NOT have been a trial, because they would be putting themselves on trial.

At another point he says the location of the Mr. X interview in Washington near the old CIA headquarters should tell us something about the role that the CIA (he says "CIA" here) played in the assassination.

Then he says that Dulles, Cabell and so on know that he (Prouty) knows that they (Dulles, Cabell etc.) "didn't do it." They may have done things that led up to it, or had something to do with it indirectly, but they didn't do it. He (Prouty) worked with these men, and if they had been planning something like that, he (Prouty) would have known about it.

Then who DID do it, asks Lex. Prouty answers with the story of the TFX.

However you look at it, it does not look good for Prouty. Yes, it is similar to Newman. Why give us all the evidence that points to the CIA and then say they didn't do it?

The crucial point is that he offers no explanation of WHY he thinks they "didn't do it," despite all the evidence he presents. "Because I knew them" is not an explanation. "Because I would have known it if they did" is not an explanation. "Because the CIA is an agency and only takes orders, by law" is not an explanation.

I can't tell if he really believes this or not. He may be saying it because he knows he has to. How would he have avoided a "wet job" if he didn't leave his former colleagues, and their institutions, an escape route?

Quite a wide escape hatch, as it appears, since it enables us to keep our sacred intelligence establishment intact. All we have to do is keep looking–forever–for the High Cabal. Just how aware Prouty is of this consequence of his leaving this escape hatch I do not know, and there is no way to know.

MM (3/20/2000)

Marty, I have to agree that the correspondence is terminal. There's something a little sad about it, but you're right, and I was having similar thoughts today myself. Things are a lot different now, for me, than in September. I don't know about you, but I have been able to develop my understanding of several people, primarily you, Vince, and John Thomas, considerably during this quite intensive correspondence, so for me at least it has been fruitful.

I hope this doesn't mean I will lose contact with you and Vince. There is nobody else I talk with or write to with the level of understanding that I feel I now share with you. Except my wife, of course, but that doesn't count, since she does everything I tell her to, anyway. (This is a joke.)

My illusion, and I see now that it was an illusion, at the beginning (I mean Sept. 99) was that all of us in the group shared a certain level of understanding, more or less defined by that COPA speech. We have discovered, rather painfully, that that is far from the case.

VS (3/22/2000)

Jim Garrison was described as a paranoic by William Turner's long-term colleague, Warren Hinckle. Turner and Hinckle co-authored a book which concluded that renegade elements of the CIA and the Mafia were solely responsible for the assassination. Harold Weisberg and I convinced Garrison that Bill Boxley was an agent. Jim Garrison in his *On the Trail of the Assassins* affirms his conviction that I was correct in my assessment of Boxley.

Boxley and Turner co-authored a memorandum which, if Garrison had acted upon it, would have finished him. Jim Garrison considered me his mentor. We were in perfect agreement that U.S. intelligence at an institutional level killed Kennedy for Cold War policy reasons. Designating me as seriously mentally ill, as two members of the group have done, necessarily impeaches the credibility of Garrison on this point. It offers the national security state an opportunity to co-opt Garrison by saying that once freed from my crazed influence, Garrison changed his view and concluded that the national security state did not kill Kennedy. The national security state could then have Garrison concluding that a renegade element killed Kennedy. Or they could conclude that Garrison bought into the scenario that a Secret Team had victimized and made a goat of institutional U.S. military-intelligence agencies, and that U.S. military intelligence institutions were therefore innocent of guilt in the killing of Kennedy.

By this letter, I am now offering those concerned the opportunity to retract their charges that I am seriously mentally ill and/or delusional. If they do so now, I waive any claim or legal action against them. If they fail to do so, then I keep most open the opportunity to take appropriate legal action designed to protect my reputation and my long service dating from 1952 as a member of the bar and as an original critic of the national security state and its role in the killing of Kennedy.

VS (3/23/2000)

Ralph, you advise me to "Please, let's stop all this. The talk of litigation harms your dignity." The litigation was first brought up by our mutual friend, who threatened to retire and live comfortably on the take from a suit against me.

Yet you in your well-intended but poorly executed mediating role, suggest that the talk of litigation harms my dignity. A good part of whatever dignity I may have, Ralph, derives from standing up and becoming steel when I am wronged. I have been wronged. I have already consulted with counsel. I have not yet decided to file suit. But do believe me when I tell you this is more than a bluff. I hold it out as a definite option. Be assured that, if I sue, I will be most dignified in court.

I agree that the legal profession has done damage by excessive litigation. But you will find that Salandria has rarely been a litigant. I am entitled to my day in court, if I choose to have it because of the wrong that this person has done me and the possible consequences my being considered mentally ill and a liar may have for how people view Jim Garrison.

Ralph, you are so wrong in your memory of what Jim Garrison said about Boxley in his book *On the Trail of the Assassins*. The fact that you are wrong does not make you mentally ill and a liar, as it might for some people. Here is what Jim Garrison says about Boxley on pages 190-192 of the volume which I have before me. See how very much at variance it is from how you describe it:

My conviction of the sex misdemeanor charge would have made headlines across the nation, the Louisiana legislature would have been left with no alternative but to remove me from office, and the C.I.A. would have accomplished one more dirty trick in the name of national security.

I analyzed the whole affair repeatedly during my visit in Los Angeles and my flight home. but I could not figure out how the Los Angeles airport police knew exactly what flight I would be on.

The answer came much later when Vincent Salandria, a distinguished Philadelphia attorney who was the most prominent critic of the Warren Commission's explanation of President Kennedy's bullet wounds, came down to see our investigative team in action. On the day Salandria arrived, Bill Boxley was presenting to the special team some evidence he had tracked down in Dallas on a recent trip.

After the meeting broke up, Salandria asked me if he could look at other material–memos, notes–from Boxley. I picked out some samples from the files, and Salandria spent the rest of the day going through the folders. When we got home, he suggested we go into the living room and talk.

"You once mentioned your concern about your office being penetrated," he said almost idly as he turned over the papers on his lap. Salandria had an unusually soft, unruffled voice, suggestive of silk sliding across silk.

"That's right," I said, "Perhaps you get paranoid in this sort of thing. It's just a feeling I've had."

"Jim," he said softly, "I'm afraid your friend, Bill Boxley, works for the federal government."

I had a cold feeling over my entire body.

And then Salandria methodically showed me why that had to be the case. Boxley's memos and summaries–each impressive in its own right–did not add up when evaluated as a whole. It was embarrassingly apparent that Boxley's material had been designed, first, to intrigue me and, second, to lead nowhere at all.

Salandria picked up the phone and called Boxley. "Bill," he said, "Jim and I have been having a conversation. We're over at his place. We wondered if you could come by."

Two hours later I looked at my watch. "He's not coming over," I said.

"I think you'll find that Mr. Boxley has gone," he replied.

I got Lou Ivon on the phone and told him to come over. Then we drove to Boxley's rented room on Canal Boulevard. I had never been in it. The landlady let us in the front door. "No," she said, "I haven't seen the man since he rented the room earlier this year. He just sends me a check every month."

She showed me Boxley's room. A shirt, folded from the cleaners, had been tossed on the bed. "He left that shirt here six months ago," she said. I showed her Boxley's home number in my address book. She shook her head. "There's no phone with that number here."

"Somewhere around here," Salandria purred, "the government has to have a very comfortable safe house. But I doubt if we'll ever see it."

I did not reply. I was thinking about the incident at the L.A. airport. It finally hit me. It was Boxley who had told the airport police which flight I would be on. He had called them from New Mexico after seeing me get on the plane. The story about an attempt to kill me was concocted. His real mission had been not to protect me but to set me up.

I was disgusted with myself. I had been so blind. In contrast, Vincent Salandria had taken a single day away from his law practice in Philadelphia, flown down, and had pegged Boxley virtually in one sharp-eyed glance.

The next day we learned that Boxley had traveled to Beaumont, Texas, following Salandria's phone call. From there, using the name of Wood, he sent telegrams to the

editors of the *Times-Picayune* newspaper and each of the local television stations stating that he had resigned as an office investigator upon learning that I was addicted to drugs.

A reporter from one of the TV stations gave a copy of the telegram to Lou Ivon and asked him curiously who this man Wood was, but that's as far as the story got; Boxley's eleventh-hour riposte disappeared like a stone dropped in the center of Lake Pontchartrain, leaving not a ripple.

Now my memory differs from Jim's on some of the details of the above narrative. But, Ralph, Jim and I were absolutely certain that Bill Boxley was a CIA agent sent in by the Agency to destroy Garrison. How can you suggest that Jim and I were not in perfect agreement on this point?

Ralph, there is one memorandum which was co-authored by Boxley and Bill Turner. If Garrison had acted on that memorandum, he would have been forever discredited. His immediate resignation would have been required. Turner had years of investigative experience with the FBI. What I saw immediately as phony had to be seen by the co-author. Yet, you are telling me that my view is "problematical." What more do you have to know to be convinced that Boxley was an agent? What more do you have to know that would convince you that Turner is an agent?

Now, we have someone describing me as mentally deranged because I have identified people as agents. Are you not convinced that federal agents are all over the field in the investigation and criticism of the Kennedy assassination? Does that make you mentally ill?

Was Garrison mentally ill when he concluded that Boxley was an agent? Was Garrison mentally deficient because he relied on my judgment in this regard?

Am I paranoid to have deduced that Turner was an agent? I don't believe that I ever mentioned this to Garrison, because I knew that he could not take it. He loved Bill Turner. Rather, I contacted Turner when he was coming to Philadelphia and offered to prove to him that he was an agent. He never responded to the invitation. I don't wonder why.

Come on, Ralph, you are a scholar. You have the mental wherewithal to come to a conclusion about Boxley and Turner. Please come to a conclusion based on the evidence that is not "problematic." What is your conclusion? What is your conclusion about Turner when he was a long-time colleague of Warren Hinckle who wrote extensively about his hatred for Garrison and Ralph Schoenman, Joan Mellen's ex-husband? What is your opinion about Turner, who co-authored with Warren Hinckle the book entitled *Deadly Secrets–The CIA-MAFIA War Against Castro and the Assassination of J.F.K.,* which concludes that the Mafia was responsible for the killing of Kennedy with renegade CIA elements that "ran amok."

What is your opinion of my truthfulness over the years you have known me?

What is your opinion of my mental balance over those years?

You speak of the "current meanness." What do you consider defamation if not mean? Do you consider it undignified to defend oneself, if necessary by suit, against being called mentally ill and a liar? Do you consider me mean, mentally ill and a liar for refusing to leave Garrison open to the charge of having been mentored by an incompetent?

Ralph, I owe you a great deal. I fully recognize my indebtedness to you. You have been of enormous help to me. I truly and deeply love you. But I question whether you are

being objective about what has transpired here and its significance for the legacy of Jim Garrison as well as for me personally.

VS (3/28/2000)

Apparently John Thomas seeks to serve first as my lawyer and now as my amanuensis. Please, John, refrain from doing so. John Thomas characterized my view of the assassination of Kennedy in his 02:44 PM 3/23/00 post as follows:

All of us have views which are shaped by our prior experiences. Yours represent a point of view I find to be often held by young people–adolescents, college freshman and others during their "rebellious years." Most people later grow to what I consider to be a more mature understanding of the world around them and realize that the idea that our federal government was hijacked by a group of criminals in 1963 and is still somehow secretly under their control in the year 2000–after the election, appointment retirement and death of literally thousands of federal officials–is completely unrealistic. Hence it is delusional. Would you care to put that question before a jury of adults?

John Thomas, please read in *False Mystery* my 1971 explanation of "The Assassination of President John F. Kennedy: A Model of Explanation" wherein I spoke of a top-level coup motivated by Kennedy's anti-Cold War policies including Cuba and Vietnam, U.S. military and CIA involvement, civilian involvement in the case of McGeorge Bundy, foreign policy changes immediately following the assassination, and the militarization of the U.S..

John Thomas, please reread my 1998 Dallas speech which you so effusively praised. I said there again and again that our national security state killed Kennedy for Cold War purposes. You will recall, John Thomas, that I said this early in the speech, and repeated the idea, as is my wont, ad nauseaum.

I submit that the manner in which the data were handled by our government demonstrates that: (1) the national security state at the very highest level of its power killed President John F. Kennedy for his efforts at seeking to develop a modus vivendi with the Soviets and with socialist Cuba, (2) subservient U.S. government, civilian Establishment and mainstream media persons criminally and systematically aided the warfare state in covering up the assassination, and (3) in light of this criminal cover-up by the American power elite there is no logical way we can conclude that the assassination was not the product of our warfare system. There was also no way rationally to conclude that the assassination was a result of the labor of the Soviets, Castro, the Mafia, J. Edgar Hoover, President Johnson, or that any lower level U.S. governmental operatives had been solely responsible for the execution of President Kennedy.

John, in my speech I never suggested that our government was hijacked by a group of criminals. Rather I spelled out and proved how the national security state at its highest levels in carrying out its mission and purpose, as those illustrious Cold Warriors interpreted them, criminally and extra-constitutionally killed our President. They had to hijack nothing. Those criminals merely vetoed through execution our civilian president who happened to be in their way.

John feels that all of that criminality is gone, and the warfare state does not hold sway over our nation. Well, I quote from *The Defense Monitor* Volume XXIX, Number 2, of the Center for Defense Information, Washington D.C.:

As it has in past years, military spending dwarfs that of all other discretionary programs....The ink was not yet dry on the President's budget before congressional

"hawks" were voicing their dissatisfaction with the Pentagon funding levels, which they considered inadequate....Asked by Congress to provide information on unfunded programs which they consider to be high priorities, the Chiefs submitted "wish lists" that totaled over $15 billion in FY 2001 alone....That the level of current military spending is scarcely below the Cold War average...

John, fortunately for me your mission and purpose are not to serve as my pro bono lawyer nor my uncompensated interpreter. I say fortunately because the quality of the service you afford me in these respects is worth precisely what you are receiving for it.

MM (3/29/2000)

Jim DiEugenio responded briefly to my letter, and I replied as follows.

Dear Jim,

Thanks very much for your letter. I appreciate it.

All the internecine fighting that is going on is very regrettable. It has pretty much destroyed my faith in the ability of human beings to achieve mutual understanding by means of language alone. In fact, it makes me wonder if mutual understanding is really what we want, and that in turn makes me wonder if we really want the truth. A big part of the truth, after all, is what goes on inside each of our different heads, and that seems to be the most difficult thing of all to share. I guess the e-mail modus compounds the difficulty by erasing all individual differences other than the words we write, which, inadequate as they are, encourages us to form alliances and enmities much faster than we do even in normal relationships.

I'll be interested to see what John [Newman] does with my thesis that Bissell and Cabell sabotaged the Bay of Pigs invasion–if he touches on that.

VS (4/3/2000)

With respect to the differences between John Thomas and me, I do not feel free to comment on John's view. I have taken exception to John Thomas's interpretation of my thinking, so this course of action on my part would be unfair to him. But I will comment on my differences with the Secret Team concept. I will comment on one difference I have with John. John has expressed the view that we can use the Kennedy assassination as a political issue. Marty and I feel that it cannot be used politically on a domestic level. My reasons for this, I will spell out below.

Marty and I feel that the assassination was powered by the highest level of our national security state carrying out systemically its mission and within its structure. We do not feel that it was an aberration caused by persons who wrongfully usurped power and improperly victimized and used that structure. Rather we believe that the killing was the work product of public officials who were operating covertly in place from their duly appointed national security state positions. In killing Kennedy we feel that they were engaged in the performance of their Cold War functions and in the assassination were in step and in accord with their governmental responsibilities. We believe that it was Kennedy and not the warfare state killers who was out of step. We feel that President Kennedy was out of step when he stated to Roger Hilsman "How can we justify fighting a war with American troops in Southeast Asia, which is nine thousand miles away, when we can't justify it in Cuba, which is only ninety miles away?"

I suggest to you that this view of the assassination is very materially and substantially different from the Secret Team concept. The difference speaks directly to the innocence or guilt of the national security state in killing Kennedy and covering up the killing. Marty's and my view accuses the national security state of guilt on both scores, the killing and the cover-up. Whereas the Secret Team concept seeks to exonerate the national security state from guilt on either score, and instead foists the blame on unnamed and unknowable Secret Team members. Marty and I speak to a system which we feel is systemically undemocratic and dangerous to the future of humankind. The Secret Team concept sees nothing basically wrong with the system, but only with the unnamed and unknowables who have victimized through unauthorized manipulation an innocent national security state apparatus.

I agree with you, Joe, and disagree with Marty, in your belief that Bill Clinton is fundamentally a well-meaning person. I would add that he is an extremely intelligent person. Therefore, I would suggest that his reluctance, or rather, refusal to open up the King assassination inquiry emanates in major part from his intelligence. I will explain.

With respect to your comment about the first purpose of our national security state, i.e. "...to protect us from legitimate national security threats," I would urge that is a de minimis purpose. We are so immensely wealthy as a nation, and so advanced militarily that I believe there is no substantial and credible foreign threat to this nation's borders. Rather, I submit that the overwhelmingly major purpose of our national security state is to protect our economic empire and the benefits and privileges that our empire produces for all of us.

Now, to explore this question, let us talk about me, and how I feel about my privileges. Let us specifically focus upon how I feel about the importance of my privileges when compared to the importance of my principles.

You have read about my dispute with one member of the group, and why I hold open the idea of a suit against this person. On principle I feel that it is necessary to protect Jim Garrison's view of the meaning of the assassination and his reputation, Garrison having relied to some extent upon my thinking to shape his own views. But I was also concerned about the effect that this person's allegations regarding my mental competence would have on my earning capacity as a lawyer. Now, I don't need that earning capacity to enjoy my life. I am a wealthy man irrespective of whether I earn a dime at the law. But please take note that this economic concern was important enough for me to raise it. The importance of my economic concerns when compared to Garrison's reputation was in terms of significance a dung heap compared to Mount Everest. But there are my economic concerns vulgarly hanging out there for all of you to see.

I am a man who in principle wants the wealth of the world to be divided more equally and equitably among all of humanity's six billion. Would I be willing to have the wealth of the planet divided up more or less equally among all of humankind and have myself reduced in economic status to be equal to the rest of my fellow humans?

Let us, for purposes of this hypothetical situation, presume that the wealth could be transferred perfectly without bureaucratic incompetence and/or corruption. Therefore, let us assume arguendo that every penny would be transferred without slippage. I would be a hypocrite to say that I would not approve of this. But I am not Jim Douglass. I would not trust myself to do this voluntarily. Oh, I would not resist it if through a world

democratic supranational state, humanity voted for it. But, unlike Jim Douglass, I would not voluntarily contribute my wealth for such a noble purpose.

If in fact the warfare-state-supported empire failed to deliver its largesse domestically. If mass movements elsewhere rendered it unworkable in the global economy. If our people and the peoples of the world voted it out of existence, then I think that you would find Salandria relinquishing, even happily, his economic benefits in favor of a fairer distribution of property. But Salandria doing it voluntarily without the political impetus of such democratic forces?

For an answer to this question let us take Salandria back to a more idealistic period in his life and test him there. From 1955 through to 1967 I was a teacher and lawyer. As a teacher I was prepared to give up my job every day in order to warn my pupils about the hydrogen bomb, the warfare state, Vietnam, and vehement anti-communism. I refused to read the bible, although the law required me to do so, in order to encourage the authorities to fire me and make me a test case. I offered myself up for arrest, with my class watching on one Saturday in order to protest what I felt was an unconstitutional law. Salandria was a fairly good man and a much respected high school teacher.

But as an individual, I was concerned about the danger of atomic war. I considered moving to Australia in order to afford some protection for my family and me. I weighed all of the above considerations, and considered my consequent value to the students as a teacher. I realized that I loved those students and loved teaching. These were important considerations. But, those important considerations aside, one of the things that popped into my head which helped to dissuade me from going to Australia was a tiny privilege.

Among my responsibilities as a teacher I had a two-period-a-week non-teaching duty of computing senior averages. It was a snap of a duty. Other duties in the school were much more onerous, such as lunch supervision, and patrolling the halls. I considered that computing senior-average duty a lark. Would you believe that such a tiny, even insignificant privilege would enter into my considerations in making such an important life decision? I became so attached to this stupid little privilege that I mistook its importance as comparing to that of my heart.

Now, Clinton knows that the U.S. worker is paid substantially higher than the Mexican, or South American, or Indonesian, or Chinese worker. Clinton knows that to a considerable extent that higher pay scale of our workers is the result of privileges which accrue to us as a consequence of our empire. Clinton knows that without our national security state, the perquisites of empire could not be secured. Clinton knows that is the reason, and not our fear of communism, that caused us to invade Grenada.

Let us posit that Clinton was not disturbed by the possibility that moving to eliminate the national security state would cause him to be dispatched as Kennedy was. Let us posit that Clinton had an interest in obtaining a democratically-arrived-at decision. He wished to put to the U.S. public the consequences of giving up or drastically reducing our national security state. He would educate the public on the negative effect that this measure would have on our empire and the negative consequences of this action on our standard of living. Let us posit that every eligible voter in the United States would vote on the question after having received full disclosure as to the consequences of giving up the national security state. Let us accept as fact, that Clinton is pretty damned good at

anticipating the voting outcome of a political issue. Would Clinton as an intelligent man anticipate that the Salandria voters would carry the day? Or would Clinton see the outcome as the Jim Douglass voters would, and opt for the reduction of the national security state and the consequent reduction in our standard of living?

Ask yourself, how many Salandrias have you come across in your lifetime who protect their least little privileges as if they were their most vital body organs? I am sure that you have seen your quite ample share of them. Ask yourself, how many people have you seen who have the decency and courage to operate at the Jim Douglass level–the very apex of human feeling and thinking–who readily share voluntarily what little they may have with the more needy? I am confident that you have found them less numerous than grains of sand. I very much fear that the perfect working of domestic democracy would fail in the case which I put to you to produce the result of redistributing globally on a more equitable and equal basis the wealth of our nation.

Jim Garrison was, as Marty urges, one who was willing to expose to the world the truth and its meaning of the Kennedy killing. He was during his lifetime pummeled for his decency. Even after his death I submit that Jim Garrison is viewed as a great enemy of our empire. Therefore, it is most important for us, if we are willing to respect his memory, to be willing to interpret accurately and precisely what he told the world and not to distort the meaning of the message which cost him so much to proclaim.

Jim well knew that his work was not likely to change the workings of the warfare state of which he was a courageous and lonely enemy. Jim was willing to bear witness to the truth and to suffer the consequences of his trumpeting of the real reasons for the killing of Kennedy. I believe that he hoped that in some future more hopeful time the world might benefit from his historical truth proclamations.

Joe, thank you for your post, and thank you for being a human being who far more closely resembles Jim Douglass than does Salandria.

MM (4/4/2000)

I agree with Vince.

As to what goes on inside Clinton's head, I doubt that he thinks about these matters at all.

MM (4/6/2000)

Vince, the Ellen Ray story will not leave me alone. Instinct tells me it is crucial.

As you know, I've written her twice at the CAQ e-mail address, and received no response. Today I'm writing there again, just to ask if that is the correct address to reach her.

May I ask for your help? After all, you are the source of my curiosity.

Vince, my request is that you write or telephone her now, and ask her what you failed to ask the last time you talked with her. They are certainly legitimate questions. (Tape record it if by phone!) Who was she working for in 1963? How did she get together with Turner? Why did they want Garrison to run for president? Who was the third man? Didn't they realize it would hurt rather than help him? Why did she call you years later? How did she get hold of your letter to Garrison?

I would have a few other questions for her, if she proved amenable to discourse, but it seems to me that as the party directly involved, you have a much better chance of getting a response from her than I do.

The e-mail address I have is info@covertaction.org.

The snail address is 1500 Massachusetts Ave. NW, Wash. DC 20005; don't have the phone but it should be easily obtainable.

MM (4/5/2000)

Vince, the crucial bit of "evidence" in all of this is the Boxley-Turner memorandum, which you said convinced you that not only Boxley, but also Turner, were agents. Where is that memo?

What, exactly, did the memo say, and why was it revelatory to you?

VS (4/5/2000)

Mike, the Boxley-Turner memorandum set forth a number of persons, including Nancy Perrin Rich and her husband, Robert Perrin, who were allegedly involved in the conspiracy to kill Kennedy. It was not a simple memorandum dropped into the lap of Garrison. Rather it had involved extensive investigation by Boxley and Turner. It was a symphony to be played by Garrison which was designed to culminate his assassination work with a crescendo of arrests of innocent people.

I was called by Harold Weisberg. He advised me that Garrison was prepared to charge several people criminally and to make several arrests based on a memorandum. Harold asked me to accompany him to New Orleans. He told me that Garrison would hold up making the charges and arrests pending our perusal of the memorandum.

Because Harold Weisberg was hurting financially, I paid his fare to New Orleans. Bernard Fensterwald went along with us.

In New Orleans Garrison gave us the memorandum. I read it in a hurry and saw immediately that it was a blizzard of lies. Weisberg spent the day and worked into through the night into the morning writing a counter memorandum demonstrating why it was completely false. Fensterwald took a passive role, but it was abundantly clear that he too held the opinion that the memorandum was just a mound of ill-smelling stuff.

When we explained to Garrison why the memorandum had to be a trap for him and had no validity, he immediately agreed. He stated that he would fire Boxley. He did so immediately.

I was convinced that Turner, as the memorandum's co-author, was equally guilty of seeking to destroy Jim Garrison. But I recognized that Jim had grown to love Turner, so I did not push on Garrison that Turner had to be connected with Boxley in a scheme to bring down Garrison. I realized that Turner had to be in full cooperation with Boxley in order to have worked with him and to have lent his investigative expertise to the production of such an obviously false memorandum. Of course, Boxley and Turner had prepared this memorandum without having shared it with the rest of Garrison's staff.

Later, when I learned that Turner was coming to Philadelphia for a radio program, I contacted him and asked him to come to my home. I told him that the visit was important, because I intended to show him why he had to be a government agent. To my request I received no reply. He came to Philadelphia and made no effort to see me.

I figured that Garrison's office had been thoroughly infiltrated by the government. I concluded that Turner, as one of the several agents, could in the future do damage. But I also figured that the infiltration was so thorough that damage was inevitable with or without Turner's efforts. I realized that the relationship between Turner and Garrison was a close one. Garrison had been traumatized by the revelation of Boxley as an agent. He

had been most fond of Boxley. I therefore, did not push at Garrison my feelings about Turner.

I am convinced that the Boxley-Turner memorandum was patently fraudulent. The memorandum had never been shared with other members of Garrison's staff. I submit that Boxley and Turner knew that if other Garrison staff members had been afforded an opportunity to read that memorandum, that it could not have withstood scrutiny. Once we exposed it as a pack of lies, neither Boxley nor Turner ever sought to defend it. It is quite simply indefensible. Nor can it be explained away as just poor but honestly intended investigative work. The obvious falsity of its material demonstrates beyond a question that it was a premeditated trap designed to finish off Jim Garrison as a viable public figure.

Those of you who are in good standing with Harold Weisberg can ask him to provide you with a copy of that memorandum along with his written refutation of it. Jim Douglass can do this. If you are interested, ask Jim to request at my expense a copy from Harold Weisberg.

I am confident that if we can retrieve a copy of the memorandum it will help settle the question of whether Turner was and continues to be loyal to Jim Garrison, and whether I am in fact irrational in my conviction that Turner was a government agent infiltrating Garrison's office to undermine his work.

MM (4/6/2000)

Vince, I am not on good terms with Harold Weisberg. As I reported to you a couple of years ago, I exchanged a few letters with him back in 1990, the end result of which was a letter from him to me that was the most vulgar and insulting piece of crazy crap that I have ever received, before or since. Personality aside, I don't believe he thinks the CIA, FBI or any other government institution was behind the assassination. What he does think is a complete mystery to me, and I am not going to try to find out again. His books (especially *Case Open*) are so poorly written as to be unreadable.

Still, if anybody wants to try, and if he is still alive and kicking on his chicken farm in Maryland, I advise extreme caution in dealing with this man. His letter to me was so crude, so hateful (and for no reason), that it frightened me. God only knows what his connections are. He too is former FBI, I believe.

Vince, you mention the late Bernard Fensterwald. Do you not also have reason to suspect that he too was a government agent? Does that put his successor, Jim Lesar, in a doubtful light as well?

Vince, in view of all that is going on now, I can't resist reminding you that I offered to write your biography, and that if you had taken me up on it, I dare say you would not have the problem of missing memos or me calling you a liar. You chose to cooperate with someone who had better credentials and a publisher behind her. Is there a lesson here?

My suggestion to you now is that you write your own autobiography, including everything that is taking place now. I offer my services as spelling-checker, and whatever else you feel I could be helpful with. You must do this, Vince, and none of your predictable excuses about not wanting to call attention to yourself, etc., will relieve you of this moral obligation.

VS (4/6/2000)

Mike, I will try to get a copy of the Boxley-Turner memorandum for the group.

Bud Fensterwald represented John McCord and sent the letter to Judge Sirica which exploded the Watergate coup. Do you have to know more about Bud Fensterwald? I don't know anything about Jim Lesar except that he is Bud's successor. You and the other group members will have to be the judge of when you are going to stop trusting a person in this area of work. You will have to ask yourselves whether an agent will pass on his work to another agent or to an innocent and honest researcher.

Of course, some members of our group take the position that the U.S. national security state is innocent of the killing of Kennedy. Therefore, those members might wish to join with known government agents since they would be reasonable in concluding that these innocent agents might very well be assigned to the task and would be seeking to arrive at the truth in the assassination. Why, after all, would not the agencies of the national security state, such as the CIA, if innocent not be eager to expose the real Secret Team members in order to protect their agencies from the imputation of guilt from the likes of Salandrias? If I were in the camp of the renegade low-level agent theory of the assassination, or the higher level than the CIA Secret Team theory, I would be most inclined to join in this project with people I suspected might be government agents.

But as things have stood with me from the beginning of my work, I was convinced that the assassination came from the soul of the national security state. Therefore I felt it was rational for me to be aware of the possibility of being infiltrated and obstructed by agents of the national security state.

Time did tell that it appeared I have had good reason to be concerned. I have been extensively audited by the IRS. I have been offered bribes. I have had my life threatened. I have had episodes of having the lugs in my car's wheels loosened. I have been the object of a known government agent offering me a bribe, if I was prepared to buy into an explanation of the JFK assassination. This explanation, like the Boxley-Turner memorandum, if true, would break the JFK assassination case wide open. The explanation of course was totally false.

The person who spent a week trying to sell me on this scheme was a publicly announced FBI agent. So far as I know, no Mafioso, no Secret Team member, and no low-level renegade connected with the assassination had any cause to be upset with me. After all, with my explication of the assassination of JFK I was exonerating all of them from blame. So far as I know, only the national security state would have had cause to seek to ruffle my feathers.

Who among you can explain how I have acted irrationally by keeping an eye open for government agents in this work? If there are any among you, please speak up now with your explanation of why I have been irrational in this regard.

People who know me will attest to the fact that I am an exceedingly trusting person. As a general proposition, my demonstration of trust in people has paid off in the excellent life which I have enjoyed. But, Mike, we cannot win them all.

I have said many times, and will set forth again for the group that I have done nothing of importance in the JFK work. But I realize now, that this may not be entirely true. There is one exception to this otherwise truthful statement. I realize now that my influencing Garrison and convincing him regarding the CIA's killing of Kennedy, was important.

But that influence did not come from my being particularly bright or insightful. It came as a consequence of my having gotten hold of a model of explanation which plainly explained the data. How did I come by this model of explanation.

It was easy for me to have come by such a model. I am the son of poor and formally uneducated Italian immigrants. My parents were Italian citizens. They never became U.S. citizens. Although my parents loved this country, they were quietly and unobtrusively suspicious of all government, everywhere, under all forms. They did not consider that the government of this country was the country. They considered the people of this nation more important and more worthy of trust than its government. They recognized that our government, like any government, could become corrupt. They were not revolutionaries. They were essentially apolitical. They were given to loving their immediate family, their neighbors, and their friends. They never conceived of empire, but I know, that if they thought of the concept of empire, they would have been opposed to it.

Therefore, when the assassination occurred, and Oswald was killed by the Jew that I predicted might appear that weekend, I thought that I owed to the society any work which I could contribute which would reveal the truth of the assassination. The assassination to me was a fire bell in the night signaling to those whose minds that were open that we were about to experience a cruel lesson from that violent teacher that goes by the name of war. What I did in terms of my meager writings and investigation was not the function of any fine or even good mind. What I did was to come to grips with what for me were self-evident truths. Any person with my mind set would have perforce come to the same conclusions with the same ease. Any person who did not have my mind set would have to struggle with the concepts. The more intellectually resourceful a person was who had a mind set which predisposed her to loving the government, the more unlikely it would be that my model of explanation would ever be accepted by such a person. The more intellectually brilliant, the more elaborate and clever would be the resistances conjured up by such a person in order to avoid to facing up to the implications of the model of explanation with which I examined the data.

Jim Garrison learned about me. I do not know how. We met. I offered him the model of explanation. Jim Garrison, for reasons which I do not know, was able to confront with ease the data and deal with them through the prism of the model of explanation which I offered to him. My influencing Jim's thinking was a mere historical accident. It does not make me important. I wish no credit for influencing him. But I will fight any suggestion that he ultimately abandoned this model of explanation and adopted another one. I have yet to see evidence to support that proposition. I will address shortly and explain our meeting in 1976 when Jim seemed to be apologizing to Tom Katen and me for departing from that model.

Mike, it would be damned presumptuous of me to write an autobiography or encourage anyone to write a biography of me. I am a boring old man. But I have a project for you. Why don't you abandon fictionalizing our correspondence? Why don't you take the correspondence of the group from the beginning and excerpt from it and produce a book. It will be an accurate representation of thinking on the subject of the JFK assassination and related matters which we have explored and might have some historical value. John Kelin, perhaps would be willing to join with you on this. He has all of the correspondence of the group and all of the extant Salandria correspondence on the assassination. The latter would not be relevant to this project.

I would be willing to pay for publication of the book, because I can't see any publisher being interested in it. I don't see any serious legal problems to its publication. If there are members of the group who object to this project, we would be glad to entertain your objections. But you must speak up.

What do you think, Mike? What do you think, John? What do you think, the other members of this group?

VS (4/6/2000)

Mike, I cannot bring myself to help you on the Ellen Ray matter. I view Ellen Ray as a loyal and loving friend of Jim Garrison. She caused the movie *JFK* to happen. She has recently declared bankruptcy.

She is connected with Noam Chomsky very likely in fund raising for her magazine. She has been attacked by a person back channel the name of whom you can readily guess.

I am certain that she got my letter to Garrison, because he entrusted it to her. He was bedridden and dying of heart failure at the time I sent the letter. She was in close contact with him then.

Mike, Ellen Ray is a fine person. I will not intrude upon her. I think that people have a right to withdraw from a cause for whatever reason they believe is necessary. This is a tough and unrewarding business. I don't expect many persons to be committed to it forever.

In this endeavor I will not help you, Mike, even if you call me arrogant for refusing to do so.

VS (4/6/2000)

Dear Jim [DiEugenio],

In my post to you of 03:13 PM 3/6/00 I wrote to you a paragraph which reportedly caused you to lose all confidence in me. Let us explore that matter in greater depth. First, I will repeat that offending paragraph:

Please don't refer to Garrison as commenting that the CIA was not institutionally involved in the killing of Kennedy. I appeared before Tom Snyder. He has absolutely no interest in the truth. If Jim curried his favor by stating that he did not mean to convey as his thought that the CIA killed Kennedy then Jim was playing games. I talked to Jim in Philadelphia at the time of his novel coming out. He came to Philadelphia and had lunch with Tom Katen and me. Both Tom and I concluded from what Jim told us at that time that Jim had been temporarily bought for the substantial money he told us that he was paid as an advance for his doing the novel. Jim Garrison in his *On the Trail of the Assassins* told us in 1988 what he truly believed...

I then went on to quote from *On the Trail*.

Jim, I feel that we should examine Garrison's three books and your *Destiny Betrayed* to determine whether or not Garrison in his novel, *The Star Spangled Contract*, was not temporarily retreating in his thinking regarding the nature of the power structure which killed and the motive for its killing of Kennedy.

Oh, I know that Jim Garrison was writing *The Star Spangled Contract* as a novelist. But we must presume that he was invited by the publisher, McGraw-Hill, to write his first novel because of the insights which he had gained in his investigation of the Kennedy assassination and not because of his untested skills as a novelist. It is extremely unlikely that the publisher would have been interested in Garrison's novel

except for its reflection of what Garrison had learned from his Kennedy assassination Odyssey.

As it turns out, *Star* proves that novel writing was not his strong suit. Jim Garrison was a lot of great things, but Tolstoy he was not. Would it not be reasonable to expect that in the normal course the publisher would be expecting a Jim Garrison novel about a presidential assassination to reflect the understandings which he garnered in his Kennedy assassination work? Would it not be reasonable to expect that Jim Garrison who had suffered so for having been the only political office holder in the world courageous enough to have fought and suffered from the power structure which had killed President Kennedy, would seek in his novel to describe precisely the nature of that evil power?

For purposes of exploring whether Jim Garrison did in fact do this in his novel, I will seek to quote from the following four books: Your *Destiny Betrayed*, 1992, and Garrison's three books, *Heritage of Stone* 1970, *The Star Spangled Contract*, 1976, and *On the Trail of the Assassins*, 1988.

I suggested in my letter to you that Jim Garrison was apologizing to Tom Katen and me for playing a game in the novel. As for Jim playing games with respect to the assassination material, you make reference to an example of this in your *Destiny Betrayed*, pages 178-179:

Later, Garrison himself, rattled by the incessant press antics, began to play their game: he would announce important developments in his investigation to offset the effect of another attack. When Garrison learned that an article critical of his case was about to appear in the *New Yorker*, he announced that a foreign intelligence agency had issued a report that agreed with his findings. Later, however, he was honest enough to admit he had made the announcement as a preemptive measure.

Yet, Jim, nobody could fairly accuse you of not believing in Garrison's passion for truth. Why should my devotion to Garrison and my role in helping his thinking be put in question by you because of my hunch? I thought that he had told Tom Katen and me that he had received a large advance for *Star Spangled Contract*, and we deemed that he was apologizing for the direction that he took in his novel.

Jim, compare Garrison's sharp insights about the motive behind the assassination as articulated in the book which he wrote before *Star Spangled Contract*, *Heritage of Stone* and the book which followed *Star Spangled*, *On the Trail of the Assassins*. I submit that a disinterested scrutiny of these books reveal important differences respecting the nature of the power structure and the motive behind the presidential assassination upon which each book dwells. After allowing for the fact that *The Star Spangled Contract* was a novel, I urge that one still can and should legitimately ask what was going on with Jim Garrison's thinking which caused him to write so differently in *Star Spangled Contract* regarding the nature of the killing forces and the motive for the presidential assassinations.

After examining his three books and your analysis, I think it is entirely legitimate to ask whether Jim Garrison was in fact apologizing to Tom Katen and me for temporarily stepping back in his thinking in *Star Spangled Contract*.

Let us start by quoting from *Destiny*:

With these connections finally made, Garrison was able to reach his most significant conclusion. Although early critics of the Warren Report, like Sylvia Meagher and Harold Weisberg, had speculated on the source of the conspiracy, and had recognized

the involvement of the Cuban exile community they could not go any further. Garrison made a quantum leap beyond them and others. He saw the military-intelligence trees in the forest surrounding the assassination... As we have seen in the previous chapter, recent work by scholars suggests that it was Kennedy's moves toward rapprochement with Castro and Khrushchev plus his proposed disengagement from Vietnam that marked him for a military-intelligence coup. Garrison realized the assassination was an inside job from conception to realization. It was too extensive, intricate, and involved for the Mob either to execute or to cover up. He accused the CIA early, in May of 1967. In July he pinpointed the reason behind JFK's death: Kennedy was trying "to obtain a radical change in our foreign policy." And as early as 1969, Garrison was onto the Vietnam angle of the conspirators. (pp. 273-275)

Now for the quotes from *Heritage of Stone*, 1970:

It was this immense domestic espionage power which the DA's office of New Orleans unknowingly took on when it began its investigation into the murder of John Kennedy... As a result, my staff and I found ourselves on a collision course with the most powerful force in the country. The battle that followed over three years exposed us to a part of America that we never dreamed existed. It became very clear to me that this was no longer the country that I had grown up in as a boy. It was a nation controlled by an enormous domestic intelligence organization which would seek to discredit or destroy anyone who dared challenge its authority (p. 21).

…The question of who killed John Kennedy evolved into the more meaningful query of why he was killed. In turn, the question of why John Kennedy was killed became a touchstone for understanding our nation's plight today as it suffers under the control of the new power apparatus" (p. 22).

…The President recognized his inherited obligation and increased the American advisory contingent in South Vietnam. However, he never budged from his refusal to send over American soldiers for combat in its swamps and jungles...The problem grew, however, in the form of Pentagon opposition to his restraint:..." (p. 225).

…While it is not generally recognized, the Joint Chiefs of Staff and the military leaders at the Pentagon have come to have very real power of their own.... The theological commitment to destroy Communism, which is representative of the power elite in the Pentagon, has strong support, along horizontal lines, from Congress, from other government agencies and from the public (p. 226).

…John Kennedy's desire to prevent an American war in Vietnam was remembered well by men who were close to him" (p. 227).

…In the fall of 1963 he issued an order, over the objections of many around him, to reduce American military advisers in South Vietnam immediately by bringing home one thousand U.S. soldiers before the end of 1963. In the spring of 1963, reports his key White House aide, Kenneth P. O'Donnell, he had made up his mind that after his reelection he would at the risk of unpopularity, make a complete withdrawal of American forces from Vietnam. "In 1965, I'll be damned everywhere as a Communist appeaser. But I don't care." Shortly before his murder, the public announcement was made by Secretary of Defense McNamara that by 1965 all American personnel would be brought back home. McNamara's announcement was made not from the Pentagon but from the steps of the White House" (p. 228).

…"He had pressed hard to attempt to reassert genuine civilian control over the military. He had obtained the removal of the Russian missile sites from Cuba and yet had prevented our own military from bombing Cuba (pp. 230-231). [We now know from the documentary evidence that the CIA and Joint Chiefs wanted not only to bomb but also to invade.]

He had taken giant strides toward ending the Cold War. He had helped to accomplish the miracle of the nuclear test ban treaty, ending the increasingly dangerous air explosions of nuclear weapons on both sides of the earth.

It is doubtful whether anyone in our time quite so young has ever done quite so much for peace on this earth.

On September 20, 1963, addressing the U.N. General Assembly, Kennedy said, "Today we may have reached a pause in the Cold War–but that is not a lasting peace. A test ban treaty is a milestone–but it is not a millennium. …if both sides can now gain new confidence and experience in concrete collaborations of peace–then surely, this first small step can be the start of a long and fruitful journey."

...two months later John Kennedy was assassinated in Dallas. But Nikita Khrushchev's reaction to the news of this tragedy showed clearly what hopes had placed in his understanding, one would be tempted to say his connivance, with the young President. He burst into tears, and according to the testimony of a high Soviet official quoted by Pierre Salinger, "He just wondered around his office for several days, like he was in a daze." As a matter of fact his sorrow was the sorrow of all humanity. (Andre Fontaine, *History of the Cold War from the Korean War to the Present*, trans. by Renaud Bruce [New York, Pantheon books, 1969, pp. 474-75.] (p. 231).

Jim, Garrison and I jointly wrote that chapter. Now, let us go to Garrison's thinking as to the perpetrators and as to the motive behind the presidential assassination expressed in *The Star Spangled Contract*. I never had read *Star Spangled Contract* until recently. I decided to read it to see what if anything I could learn about what Garrison seemed to be telling Tom Katen and me. Now I know.

Compare Garrison's clear thinking as set forth above with the following gibberish he wrote in *Star Spangled Contract*:

...the billion dollar overrun the Air Force was encouraging its fighter-plane manufacturers to accrue each year" (p. 22).

…Oh, there's no doubt that Underwood's the grand master at assassination–in a country that can boast more than its share. Of masters, I mean. That means he's pretty far up–in some structure. But in which structure? C.I.A.? Underwood retired from the Agency years ago. But is Poucher using Underwood to bring in other C.I.A. people, or is Underwood enlisting from D.I.A.? Or even someplace else? And Poucher–is Poucher working this for the Pentagon and the Joint Chiefs, or for some independent outfit or D.I.A.? And from the picture you've given me of the interplay between our various agencies, our esteemed General Underwood and our no less esteemed General Poucher might not even be genuinely integral parts of the structure backing the assassination. They might merely appear to be center stage–and believe the roles themselves–while the crucial scenes are being played backstage...." (p. 35).

We now see how Garrison entertained the thought that the inside figures might be manipulated by outside forces. This was a change in his thinking from that of the Kennedy assassination having been an inside job from start to finish.

Garrison next told us what was behind the presidential assassination in *Star Spangled*:

Quiller blinked. "All right, old son," he said, and smiled. "Now to the point. The issue is Greece. The President is determined to support the popular government there, while Poucher and the Pentagon are pressing the President to help put the Greek military back in power. Naturally, with the Greek military back in the U.S. would have more control. The pressure on the President is strong. Control of the Middle East oil is involved, the Mediterranean as a base for the oil is involved, the Mediterranean as a base for the Sixth Fleet, et cetera. The usual," Quiller said" (p. 40).

Garrison was now focused upon Greece and oil as the motivating reasons for a presidential assassination. In *Star Spangled Contract* the global nature of the Cold War had disappeared from his radar screen.

Let me begin: "I am informed that the execution of the plan has been placed in the hands of the Central Intelligence Agency–more precisely, that the assignment resides with elements of Covert Operations Division, C.I.A.–although Agency top management is ignorant of the operation" (pp. 128-129)."

Here we see that Garrison introduced the concept of the Agency's top leadership having been not complicit in the presidential assassination but instead having been victimized by the assassins.

"You will wish to know that the success of this destroy-action owed to information passed by an officer of C.I.A. sympathetic to the splinter faction. You will wish to know that his motive is to discredit D.I.A. by involving D.I.A. through specious evidence at the destroy-action site. You will wish to know that this officer is in the act of conveying gross facts and attendant distortions to the news media, clandestinely and in a professionally designed 'story line' package."

Here we see that Garrison dealt with the concept of splinter or renegade elements of the CIA. We also observed him explaining how the U.S. press was innocently taken in by the misinformation. Did not the Garrison of *Heritage* see enough of the workings of the U.S. press to know that the press was not a victim of misinformation? Was he not aware that the press gleefully sought the misinformation so that it could be used in a premeditated fashion by the press to destroy him?

"You will wish to know that the motive of this officer extends to the discrediting of the Joint Chiefs of Staff and, most specifically, to you, Sir."

Again, Garrison described the Joint Chiefs, who were being characterized as innocents, as being wrongfully discredited.

The composition of the Central Intelligence Agency was intricate beyond belief. And it followed from this that no one there could know everything (wasn't this the motive behind the Agency's Chinese-puzzle architecture?) (p. 158).

According to this structural view of the CIA it would be difficult to blame the institution of the CIA for any of its crimes.

"Yes, of course," the President said. "I am happy to restate my position, and I am sorry it does not find favor with you and your colleagues, General–but I must again say that I choose to see a Greece that is strongly supported in the direction of democratic rule. It is my judgment our best interests lie in backing a popular government in Greece..."

Garrison apparently felt that the world had changed since he had written *Heritage*. Foreign policy decisions regarding Greece loomed large over *Star Spangled Banner*.

Whereas in *Heritage* Greece as a central and critical foreign-policy problem would have not interested Garrison. He was fixed on Vietnam.

"And when I talk about self-interest, I'm talking of protecting national economic interests in oil traffic and so forth, and strengthening the nation's defense posture as well" (p. 178).

Here Garrison continued to see oil as more important than the Cold War.

"And the J.C.S. are getting their marching orders from the good old oil and armaments and heavy-industry boys."

Here again, we see the military-industrial complex was strictly about money and oil with no immediate connection made to the Communists.

"...As for his subsequent politics, well, he became, shall we say, unbalanced on the communism issue. He failed to realize that there really was no issue–that capitalism and communism are the same thing–material solutions to material problems–and therefore highly compatible systems that are destined to overcome their superficial differences. A family. That's what Russia is to the U.S.–family" (p. 250-251).

With this Garrison caused the Cold War and military-intelligence madness to disappear as a central problem. According to him capitalism and communism now became the same thing.

At the Russian embassy only night lights shone here and there. The staff had retired early. There was nothing to keep anyone awake. Second-strike nuclear capability on the part of both superpowers meant diplomats and tacticians could sleep when they want to. Moreover, the U.S. and the U.S.S.R. had long ago acknowledged large joint interests. The respective militaries had established fundamental sweetheart agreements. Of course, a steady display of seeming antagonisms had to be maintained for reasons of arms-industry profits, general good showmanship and simple diversion. The Russian military and the K.G.B. had been fully briefed by the Pentagon well in advance of the scheduled American enterprise in Greece. In exchange for a promise of foot-dragging in the matter of further American arms support of Turkey, the Russians had approved the Greek venture and would not make an issue of it in the United Nations. So far as the Russians were concerned, the seizure of the liberal Greek government was as good as accomplished, and they had moved their attention on to other, more critical, matters (p. 304-305).

So much for Garrison's view of a Cold War presidential killing. So much for Garrison's explanation of the assassination as a conspiracy by the CIA-military forces to head off JFK's efforts to end the Cold War. The Russians and the U.S. secretly combine to circumvent the United Nations and facilitate a military take over of the Greek government by its militarists.

In summary, the meandering and unfocused theory behind the presidential assassination in *Star Spangled,* and the novel itself, does not constitute a work of which Jim Garrison could have been proud. I would defy you, Jim, to read the book and come up with one half-decent reason why any profit-motivated publisher would have published that book, let alone have provided the author with an advance.

I feel that for whatever reason Jim Garrison had for writing that book, he did indeed seem to be addressing to Tom Katen and me and apologizing for being responsible for it. After having read it, I am convinced that Jim was indeed apologizing to us.

That is not to say that after our luncheon in Philadelphia in 1976 I did not remain loyal to Jim. And while he was apologizing, I had every confidence that he would soon enough become again the courageous, insightful, brilliant Jim Garrison whom I had come to love. My confidence was rewarded. In 1988 his *On the Trail of the Assassins* was published. Jim was by then back in great form. Note the following quotes from that work:

Upon close examination, then, the false sponsors all fall of their own weight. What remains as the only likely sponsor with both the motive and the capability of murdering the President is the covert action arm of the Central Intelligence Agency.

Invisible as it is dangerous, the covert operations apparatus of the C.I.A. has become far and away the most powerful element in the intelligence community. It is the closest to the top levels of the government and, at least since the 1950's, has assumed a steadily increasing role in the determination of foreign policy.

As distinguished from intelligence collection, covert operations include the development and distribution of propaganda (the euphemism is disinformation), the raising of secret armies, the staging of coups d'etat, and even murder–everywhere and anywhere, internationally and domestically, but always hidden. Such concealed operations represent more than two-thirds of the C.I.A.'s total activity, as C.I.A. officer Philip Agee once put it, "a secret political police...the Gestapo and S.D. of our time" (pp. 289-290).

Richard Bissell, former deputy director for plans, also acknowledged that assassination was included in the "wide spectrum of actions" available to eliminate chiefs of state who were a problem. It seems fair to state, then, that the C.I.A., from long experience, had the necessary capability to assassinate President Kennedy.

Equally important, it had the motivation. Contrary to what most Americans assume, the C.I.A. was not created solely to gather intelligence. From its beginnings in 1947 the primary reason for its existence, as exemplified by the dominant role of its operations directorate, was the defeat of what it perceived as a monolithic communism.

…To the hard-line, war-oriented elements of the American power structure, for whom the C.I.A. operations directorate had been created and for whom it functioned, this was nothing less than "selling out to the communists."

In retrospect, the reason for the assassination is hardly a mystery. It is now abundantly clear from the course that U.S. foreign policy took immediately following November 22, 1963, why the C.I.A.'s covert operations element wanted John Kennedy out of the Oval Office and Lyndon Johnson in it (pp. 292-293).

…The Gulf of Tonkin resolution, passed on August 7, 1964, with only two Senators dissenting, gave Johnson the power to take whatever military action he felt necessary in Southeast Asia.

…Thus was President Kennedy's foreign policy reversed "without conforming to the formal requirements for changing office holders, as prescribed by the laws or constitution"–the very definition of a coup d'etat. This was the major consequence of the assassination of John Kennedy and the real reason for it.

Is all this plausible? It might not have seemed so 25 years ago. However, now that we know some of the true history of the C.I.A. and its covert operations, the answer is a distinct yes. Assassination is precisely what the Agency knows how to do and what it has done all over the world for policy ends.

…However, it is not too late for us to learn the lessons of history, to understand where we are now and who runs this country. If my book can help illuminate this for a younger generation who never knew John Kennedy, then it will have served its purpose (pp. 295-296).

So, Jim DiEugenio, we can see that in writing his *On the Trail of the Assassins* Jim Garrison was back painting a stark and precise historical picture of who killed Kennedy and why. Yes, Jim, I respectfully submit that I have good reason to question why Garrison sounded so confused in articulating a scenario for the killing of a President in *Star Spangled Contract*. In that work as a novelist he was entitled even without benefit of evidence to fill in gaps and to paint a clear picture for the reader. Instead, he presented a cloudy and confused mess. From the above quoted excerpts from *On the Trail of the Assassins* published in 1988 it is quite clear that Garrison recovered his clarity.

Jim, can you fairly dispute my love for Garrison because I thought I heard him apologize to me about *Star Spangled Contract*? Love includes being willing to see the warts and to seek to explain them. Love includes the right to ask questions about the loved one. Love includes the humanization of the object of one's love so that the image that is captured in the mind's eye is a realistic conception of a human being who by virtue of belonging to the species is not a god, and therefore is necessarily flawed. But Jim, notwithstanding his flaws, was in my judgment a great man who earned, received and never lost my admiration.

MM (4/6/2000)

Ok, Vince, re Ray, I can understand the personal aspect. But just between you and me, what do you think was/is her role in this blooming buzzing confusion?

VS (4/6/2000)

What do I think that Ellen Ray was up to when she came with Bill Turner and the other guy to my home? She did not speak at all. She just sat there looking amazingly beautiful. Turner and the other guy did the talking. I had serious difficulty paying any attention to their pitch. Ellen's beauty caused me to be light-headed.

What was her role other than the one that she served to dazzle me with her incomparable lower limbs? In retrospect, I think that she was taken by Jim Garrison and liked the idea of his running for President. She was young and no doubt very idealistic. As for Turner and the other guy, they had to know that the idea was outrageous.

This is another compelling reason to feel that Turner had to be on the government's payroll.

MM (4/7/2000)

Vince, I fully understand your feeling for Ellen Ray, because I too am a leg man. :-) But I am not out to "get" her (no pun intended), any more than I am out to get Chomsky or Newman or anybody else. What I am trying to get is some insight into what goes on in these people's brains. This is not only very important, but the most important thing of all, in my opinion. If I don't understand, really don't have an inkling, what goes on in these people's minds, I do not understand reality. Reality includes the way other people see the world. It is very important for me to understand the way Ellen Ray and Noam Chomsky (less so but also Newman) view the world. Why? Because I have enormous respect for them. These are not just people. They are the people who matter the most to me intellectually.

The same thing is true of you, Vince. Do you think I could just leave it alone, if there were any real cause to doubt you, to doubt your sincerity, your truthfulness, your willingness to share your honest thoughts with me, even whether you are a friend at all? I wouldn't be able to leave that alone any more than I would if it concerned my family. The latter is personal, but intellectual relationships are also personal, if they are important to you, and to me they are.

No, Vince, I don't think you are arrogant for refusing to pursue Ellen Ray with me, but I don't understand it. You don't know her personally, except for that one meeting in question, and since you have never tried it, how do you know how she would react? Maybe she would be only to glad to explain. How do you know that she declared bankruptcy, and why do you fear that questioning her would exacerbate her financial problems?

The person you refer to as having recently attacked Ray told me to leave Ray alone–and also said something about bankruptcy. This does not make sense, in itself. Nor does it make sense that you should be steering clear of Ray out of deference to this person, so I just don't get it.

Vince, I have made this point many times, but we do not seem to get beyond it. It bothers me. People like John Thomas and John Newman are interesting, and we are not wasting our time trying to understand what motivates them. It's not that easy, as you know, especially when you consider that people also change (Thomas!), and when they do are not necessarily aware of it, or willing to admit it. However, Chomsky and Ray are much, much more interesting than John Thomas or John Newman. Neither one of the latter has a large body of work behind them to attest to the progressive, liberal, humane, leftist, rational, disabused, realistic, sophisticated, well-informed, etc. mind that produced it. When minds like these do crazy things, we must be concerned. We can't just say, Well, sometimes they do crazy things, but most of the time they're right on.

That doesn't work for me, anyway. How would it work for you if I suddenly said I disbelieved in the Holocaust? Would you say, Oh well, he's crazy on that score, but otherwise I agree with him? Would that settle it for you? If it did, it would mean you didn't have much respect for me after all, and didn't really care what I thought. You cannot respect someone and not care what they think. Therefore, I have no choice in the matter: I care about what you think, and I care about what Chomsky and Ray think. I cannot simply put it aside. It is of the utmost importance. It is much more important than what John Thomas thinks, and we have certainly put plenty of time and energy into that.

But there is a very big problem in understanding Chomsky et al., and now similar questions (of motivation, credibility, honesty) have come up about Ray. This is not only because of her encounter with you, but surely you have asked yourself why the leading (only?) journal dedicated to exposing the CIA's dirty secrets has never published anything on the assassination(s). I have a letter from a former CAQ editor saying "we" believe the Mafia and rogue CIA agents were behind the assassination." Obviously there are strong connections (and contradictions re JFK) between Ray and Chomsky, so we are looking at the same can of worms (or fount of wisdom, if that's it) here.

How are we ever going to find out what really goes on in their heads unless we ask them, or at least try to engage them in some kind of dialogue that would give us some hints? I do not understand why you are not as curious about this as I am.

You have said that the left did not want to join the JFK dissidents because they were afraid of having the assassination blamed on them, or having it discredit them by association with a "leftist" assassin. I hope I'm summarizing your view correctly. You have expressed it a number of times, and I have tried to argue with you about it, but I don't believe we made any progress. I still think this is only credible (but not convincing) if applied to perhaps some leftists right after the assassination, but it is very far-fetched to think this could explain the behavior of the Chomskys of today.

What I do not understand about you, Vince, is that you seem so ready to draw the line before Chomsky and Ray, when that, for me, is precisely the point where the more serious and more interesting questions begin. I don't want to expose anyone or hurt anyone personally. I want to understand how and why a Chomsky can have certain opinions that appear to me (and you) to be in total contradiction to everything else he says. I am certainly not satisfied that he has changed all of his published opinions because he referred to your COPA speech as "lucid."

What does it matter? I'll tell you, but why am I telling you? Why are we different here? Why is it not obvious to you that whatever the game Chomsky et al. are playing, whatever they are keeping from us, is the very heart of the matter. As I have said before, scratch Newman and I doubt that you will find anything more interesting than a patriot. The situation with Chomsky et al. is completely different. What do we get when we scratch there? You saw what I found in Chomsky: hysteria. He blocked. But what is behind the hysteria, the blockade? That is the very reality, the view of the world, that we want to understand, is it not? What could the people we think are in power have told this man–and not any man but this particular man–that could convince him to act in this uncharacteristic, irrational, and inscrutable way?

Whatever it was, it must have been a powerful argument. Do you think that a John Thomas or a Major Newman would require the same kind of argument to be convinced of the rightness and necessity of certain things, including dishonesty? Can you say with any confidence that if you were confronted with the same arguments that could convince a Ray and a Chomsky to behave as they do, you would act any differently? To put it simply, maybe if we knew what they know, we'd act the same way. If that is the truth, we want to know it, don't we?

Ellen Ray could be helpful in pursuing these questions, and I see no reason why her personal welfare would be endangered by a couple of perfectly legitimate and understandable questions (she went to your house, after all; she called you, so why shouldn't you call her?). So I do not understand your reluctance to contact her. There is a lot to be gained here. Perhaps she could help us understand Chomsky, perhaps to understand a whole mentality–shared (partially or wholly) by her, and others.

I don't mean to cajole you, Vince, I respect your decision. But I am very much interested in your thoughts on these questions, because to me they are the most important questions of all.

I remain your true friend and ally,

P.S. Your reply to Jim DiEugenio was brilliant, and I'll more to say on it later. It belongs in the historical record. Which we are taking into our own hands now, right folks?

VS (4/7/2000)

John, you are inquiring about the accuracy of Josiah Thompson's description in 1995 at the COPA conference of how we came to meet one another.

Thompson's account here is right about my being called by the ACLU to go to the suburbs to see what I could do to get Thompson and another group of peace people out of jail. His embellishments made at the 1998 COPA speaking engagement are wrong. I was not the brilliant lawyer that he described me as in his 1998 COPA speech. Rather, I talked quietly to the police, and mystery of mystery they let the whole group out without an argument. Having spent years trying to extricate peace people from jails, I was amazed that to find that I never had an easier time in getting peace people freed from the grips of our Cold War infected police. I now wonder whether the whole meeting with Thompson was not a set up. You will recall that in my 1998 COPA speech that the ACLU extracted a resignation from me because of my assassination work. Do you think that the ACLU was in the service of the Mafia or the Secret Team?

In contrast to this easy time that I had in rescuing Thompson and his associates from the police, compare what happened to me when I rescued a kid from the clutches of the police in Philadelphia while Arlen Specter was the District Attorney. The young many, the night before he was drafted into the military, was walking down a Philadelphia street wearing a tie which resembled an American flag. Officer Brown arrested him for disorderly conduct. His psychiatrist father called me late at night to see what I could do. I went to the Round House in Philadelphia where a Philadelphia magistrate heard the matter. I pointed out to the magistrate that the young man was doing nothing other than exercising his first amendment rights. The magistrate agreed. The District Attorney, with whom I was friendly, made no objection. The young man walked.

On the way out I remarked to Officer Brown in a polite fashion that he should respect the first amendment to our constitution. Whereupon, he and his colleague went to the only exit to the Round House and bracketed the door. I knew what that meant. So I waited patiently until the Assistant D.A., Charles Bernsee came out of court. I pointed the two police officers to Bernsee. I asked him what I should do. He said, "Leave, I am here."

As I tried to ease my way through the door, the police seized me. They ripped my rain coat and carried me over to a wall smashing me against it. I asked them to bring me before the magistrate. They obliged. They charged me with assaulting police officers and resisting arrest. I was handcuffed, hands in the back, and spent the night in jail.

Arlen Specter continued the prosecution. I got a high-priced civil rights and anti-trust lawyer, Henry Sawyer, III, to represent me. Eventually, the matter was dismissed, because I had witnesses to the episode. Bernsee never said a word in my defense. He was no doubt under orders from his boss, Arlen Specter.

I sued the City of Philadelphia. The high-priced lawyer, to whom I had paid $l,600.00 in fees, was willing to accept $50.00 in payment of my rain coat from the City. I fired him. Later, prior to trial, I accepted $800.00 in settlement. I did not feel like pressing the matter, other than to bring decent closure to it. That my friends was how Salandria was treated. Thompson's treatment was different. I relate the above incident to show you that Salandria was not that as brilliant as a lawyer as Thompson reported. Something other than my brilliance sprang Thompson and his friends with such ease. I ask, do you think that maybe the Mafia or the Secret Team forced Specter to prosecute me?

John, Thompson is absolutely wrong when he says that "...the two were soon collaborating on new articles." We were not collaborating on "articles." Rather, we were collaborating on the book which turned out to be *Six Seconds in Dallas*.

I quit immediately when Thompson tried to convince me that the Kennedy throat wound was a consequence of a bit of bone exiting from the throat which emanated from the head hit. I told Thompson that I would not be associated with a work which left open to the government contrary to fact a means of extricating itself from the need for a single-bullet theory in order to comport with a three-shot assassination. I saw him as possibly at some future time seeking to help the government to explain away its dire ammunition shortage if and when the single-bullet fantasy was thoroughly discredited.

I became immediately suspicious of Thompson, because I thought that he might have represented an effort for the government to ease me into the major media and get me gradually over to being ultimately one of their critics. Later, as I have previously reported, after *Six Seconds in Dallas* was published, I invited him over to my home for a party.

At the affair, I put to him how he could have written the last paragraph of *Six Seconds* which concluded with the question of what does all of this prove? He answered his question by flatly stating that it did not prove a conspiracy.

"Tink, how could you write that?" I asked him.

He answered: "An error in exposition, Vince. An error in exposition."

After comparing notes with Ray Marcus about it, he and I concluded that Thompson was an agent. I so advised Thompson of my feeling in writing. Please note that when I call someone an agent, I do so quite openly and don't deny it. John, you have my correspondence on this matter.

Now, so many years later, Thompson's "error in exposition" is converted into another explanation. Thompson currently describes himself as an agnostic on the issue of conspiracy in the Kennedy assassination.

We also know from the government documents that he was approached for possible employment by the CIA prior to the assassination.

MM (4/7/2000)

Your reply to Jim DiEugenio is brilliant, and totally convincing. There can be no question what Garrison really thought, since he expressed it very plainly, and nothing he said or didn't say in a novel can affect that.

It is merely an interesting aside that he does seem to be playing with a Secret Team hypothesis in the novel–which I haven't read. Who knows why. You seem to imply that it was the publisher's condition, which may well be the case. Or I suppose it is also possible that he went through a phase where he was actually drawn to that hypothesis. But it is perfectly clear that by 1988, at least, he had the same position as in 1970.

A good biographer would certainly go into that–interviewing everybody who might remember anything Garrison may have said about the novel, his publisher's input, etc. Since you and Tom Katen are the only people I ever heard of that he talked to about the book, and Tom Katen is deceased, you would be my Informant No. 1, and given the history of your close association with Garrison, your credibility would also be No. 1. Your report of what Garrison said, and your opinion of why he said it, would be of great importance to me. Of course people can be "temporarily bought." Maybe he bought himself. Maybe he felt himself at the time that this would be if not the best, at least one

way to get part of the truth out. In any case, the bottom line is that it was a novel, and we have the non-fiction to totally refute it as a theory of what the man really thought.

I would ask you to reconstruct as much of the conversation as you could. Where did you eat, what restaurant? What else did you talk about? What did Tom say? Such questions would be intended to help you relax and possible dredge something up from memory (25 years ago, after all) that would be interesting or useful.

The last thing I would do, if I knew anything the subject matter at all, would be to jump from this remark about being "temporarily bought" to some sort of conclusion that you didn't understand Garrison at all, that you insulted him or lost faith in him, that you were trying to denigrate him–or whatever it is that certain people are apparently accusing you of doing. This simply does not make sense, if it comes from people who are genuinely interested in the truth about Jim Garrison.

And let's try it this way: Do you have any idea who might have a different opinion about the significance of the views expressed in the novel? Who has expressed such a view? If this has not come up before, why is it coming up now? Is it pure coincidence that this (potential) thesis–the Secret Team thesis–is coming up now in relation to Garrison just at the time when this theory appears to be gaining ground (within our own group, for example)? Is it coincidence that this is precisely the thesis that you and others (me too) have identified as the second line of defense and cover-up–the rogue agent/Mafia/Secret Team/High Cabal? (To those who would protest lumping those together, I remind them that the common denominator of these theories is that they all exonerate the existing governmental institutions.)

We have arrived again at the same point we were when the debate about "rogues" vs. "institutions" petered out. It may have petered out, because there was no judge or formal verdict, but in my opinion you clearly won that debate. The institutions (like the CIA) are responsible, as institutions, for the damage caused by their employees, period. Or, as our own John Thomas said, the intelligence establishment empowers the Secret Team. You cannot empower something and not be guilty for what it does.

So this is where we are, as I see it, and as I have said (too) many times: I say to the Secret Team theorists, Show me the reasons why we have to live with evil. The Spook House ("intelligence establishment" seems an unnecessary and inaccurate euphemism) empowers evil, we all agree. What do we disagree on? Whether or not the Spook House "is necessary to maintain liberty and democracy," again to quote John Thomas. Prove it, I say. They have the status quo, but is that proof that things are the way they should and could be? I'll give them their military secrets, provided we have an acceptable mechanism for limiting them to the essentials, but that does not by any means justify the Spook House we have now.

The burden of proof should be on them, even if the status quo is on their side. Have you noticed how many people have leapt to the defense of the Spook House, how many people have even bothered to confirm John Thomas's assumption that it is necessary to maintain liberty and democracy? Not one person. Not even John Thomas has dared to repeat the statement, much less defend it. That is because they know perfectly well how enormous a gulf there is between "necessary" secrets and the amount of information our so-called democratic government is withholding from us now. They know that if they get into that argument, into the position of having to defend the Spook House, they will lose. That, in turn, would force them to revoke the logic that allows

them to tolerate the Secret Team: If there is no Spook House, there is no Secret Team, because the Spook House empowers the Secret Team.

What then? Get rid of the Secret Team by getting rid of the Spook House? I do not understand why this is such a frightening proposition, but it seems to be. It seems to be taken as the equivalent of getting rid of the government, of revolution in the classic sense, although why this jump is made I don't understand either. Can you explain why wanting to do away with the CIA should be taken as equivalent to wanting to do away with the United States of America? Is this is simply a reflection of the extraordinary depth of penetration of the state propaganda (a tool of every state, to be sure) in the US today? Love the US, love my CIA?

I will sum up our entire discussion so far in a short play:

Actor 1: "We need them."

Actor 2: "But they cause evil. Why do we need them?"

All: [Total silence.]

VS (4/10/2000)

Mike, you asked me to help you understand what goes on in people's brains when they will not accept a broad conspiracy in the killing of Kennedy, or once having accepted it, will not continue to pursue the matter. I will try to give you my answer to your question. But, your question, like many you put, is not an easy one for me to answer.

For a start I would go to Sophocles' *Antigone*. The guard who reported the burial by Antigone of her brother against the fiat of the tyrant, Creon, uttered a platitude: "Nobody likes the bringer of bad news." What you and I believe happened in the assassination, i.e. that the national security state killed Kennedy for Cold War foreign policy reasons, and the U.S. Establishment and press combined to cover up the nature of the killing, is in the words of Sophocles "bad news."

Who can benefit from proclaiming such bad news? No one. Who will be willing to listen to us, be convinced by our evidence for such a thesis, and then be willing to accept responsibility for acting upon this conviction? Even in our group, which has had years to examine the data, we are still in the minority. Of those who are convinced, what is there to do? No political party will entertain such a matter as a plank in its platform. No politician can be expected to take up our cause. Politicians remember what happened to Jim Garrison. No organ of the mainstream press will entertain airing our thinking. Our pronouncements will at best be ignored. At worst we will be called mentally ill for espousing such a view.

Many of those who committed themselves to this point of view have quietly retired from the discussion. Dave Dellinger and Staughton Lynd, who fought so hard and successfully to get my early articles printed in *Liberation*, have long since stopped speaking to this issue. I think I know why.

After the Gulf of Tonkin incident, Dave Dellinger visited me at my home in Philadelphia. I discussed the Gulf of Tonkin incident with him. I asked him whether he shared my view that there was no attack by North Vietnamese torpedo boats on our destroyers. He said that he did. I asked him why *Liberation* did not advise its readers accordingly. Dave said that it could not. I asked him why not?

Dave Dellinger said that there was no way that the U.S. public would be convinced that its government could practice such deception. The best that *Liberation* could do was take issue with the reaction of our government to the Gulf of Tonkin

incident. Complaint could be made by *Liberation* that the U.S. government had over reacted to the North Vietnamese torpedo attack, by bombing North Vietnam. But *Liberation* could not advise its readers that there was no attack on the destroyers, because the U.S. public was not ready for that.

So, too, I think that Dave Dellinger, in his courageous and astute mind, figured that the U.S. citizenry was just not ready to accept the truth, i.e. very bad news about the nature of the forces behind the assassination of JFK and their motivations for the killing. Dave has spent a lifetime at the head of non-violent radical activity. His contributions towards peace have been considerable. His reputation as a gutsy, brainy, and honest extreme left non-violent political leader is solid and deserved. If he had continued to pursue the Kennedy assassination, he would have not enjoyed the same success that came to him by separating himself from our cause.

Mike, the expression of accepting the truth of the Kennedy assassination was described to me by Jim Garrison as the equivalent of swallowing a watermelon. I once told you that your writing a book seeking to put forward our thesis of the Kennedy assassination and the theory that AIDS was a man-made population control device was the like trying to get the public to swallow two watermelons.

AIDS is not my area of expertise. I am not able to venture an intelligent opinion on the subject. But if I were, and I was convinced by the evidence that AIDS was a man-made device to control population, I would hesitate long before rushing to embrace publicly that view. If I did publicly accept this view, my isolation as a political thinker would be almost complete. My friends who tolerate my JFK views with considerable difficulty would seek to make themselves scarce. My wife would feel that I had become unreliable and irresponsible. My colleagues at the bar would en masse cross the street when they saw me heading in their direction. My office colleagues would feel that my years had caught up with me and would suggest that they were being cheated by my services even if they were being rendered pro bono.

What could I gain from honestly arriving at your AIDS conclusion? I would be able to look at myself in a mirror and quietly observe an honest person who had walled himself into a box of oblivion. I would see a person starved for access to his wife, friends, colleagues, and fellow citizens. I would see a person who was not only a person without a country but a person without the warmth of human contact.

Mike, we have nothing to offer a Noam Chomsky or an Ellen Ray except to invite them to cut off their access to the publics for and from whom they have carefully cultivated respect and affection. I know that Ellen Ray has a complete understanding of what happened in the Kennedy assassination which conforms to our feelings. But Sheridan Press has gone under. She is already reduced in her ability to speak truth to power. Why should she continue to push our dead-end issue and cause her public voice to be reduced to a decibel level which effectively silences it?

When Noam Chomsky described my speech as lucid, he was telling us that he knows we are not irrational. But he also was telling us that he will not change his mind. For him to open his mind completely and to absorb what we hold to be the truth, and to adopt that truth as his, and to go public on it, he knows will isolate him and make him less effective. The U.S. public, he knows, is just not ready to accept the U.S. empire as having been capable of devouring its own head of state in a military spasm. Therefore, he is not ready by accepting our cause to diminish the good that he accomplishes by

explicating the truths with which a significant segment of the U.S. public is willing to entertain. He refuses to choke on our watermelon.

Mike, I am for allowing an Ellen Ray and Noam Chomsky to decline to join us and for us to continue respect them and to allow them to retain their dignity in doing so.

VS (4/11/2000)

Owen, you wrote to me:

You may have forgotten that you wrote this...

David Halberstam was correct to quote one of McGeorge Bundy's colleagues as stating that Bundy "...is a very special type, an elitist, part of a certain breed of men whose continuity is to themselves, a line to each other and not the country."

If this is correct... What I read out of this statement is, again, more evidence of a secret team outside of institutions.

Owen, I have not forgotten that I wrote the above. I very early spotted McGeorge Bundy as having been involved in the heart of the assassination while operating from within the heart of governmental Cold War institutions. When I learned about what the Situation Room of the White House was reporting that Oswald was the assassin to the presidential and Cabinet planes on the afternoon of the assassination I knew that McGeorge Bundy, who was in charge of the Situation Room, was complicit in the killing. I did not hesitate to say so in public. I said so in my 1971 speech from which you quote.

Owen, when I think of "country" I don't think of "the government." For me the government is to be no more than the servant of the people. For me the country is not its government but its people. McGeorge Bundy, while he held great power in the government and in the U.S. Establishment, I am certain did not view himself as a servant of the people. He was an elitist who I feel thought of the people as an undisciplined, unschooled mob, who required him and his Establishment to run the government so that they might keep order. But I am convinced that he considered himself very much a part of the government, and viewed his Establishment as in control of it.

You consider Bundy part of the Secret Team. But how can you, Owen, taking that view seek to extricate him from the national security state of which he was a prominent part? How can you exculpate the national security state from guilt in the killing of Kennedy when Bundy and other national security state leaders were obviously complicit in the killing and/or the cover-up?

As distinguished from your view, I described Bundy in my 1971 speech "The Assassination of President John F. Kennedy: A Model of Explanation") as manipulating and controlling important aspects of the governmental operations while he was very much in and playing a vital role in government. Further, I devoted a separate section of the speech to show how Bundy, as head of the Ford Foundation, when he stepped out of government, used that Foundation to promote domestic discord.

But allow me to repeat the segment of the speech which deals with Bundy's governmental role in the killing and covering up of the killing of President Kennedy:

Bundy Issued the First "No Conspiracy; Lone-Assassin" Statement

What was McGeorge Bundy doing on the day President Kennedy was dispatched? Theodore H. White, in his book, *The Making of the President, 1964* tells us that the presidential party on its flight back to Washington on the afternoon of that fateful day "learned that there was no conspiracy, learned of the identity of Oswald and his arrest..." this was the very first announcement of Oswald as the lone assassin. In Dallas, Oswald

was not even charged with assassinating the President until 1:30 A.M. the next morning. The plane landed at 5:59 P.M. on the 22nd. At that time the District Attorney of Dallas, Henry Wade, was stating that "preliminary reports indicated more than one person was involved in the shooting...the electric chair is too good for the killers." Can there be any doubt that for any government taken by surprise by the assassination–and legitimately seeking the truth concerning it–less than six hours after the time of the assassination was too soon to know there was no conspiracy? This announcement was the first which designated Oswald as the lone assassin. Who was responsible for that announcement?

That announcement came from the White House Situation Room. Under whose direct control was the White House Situation Room? The Situation Room was under the personal and direct control of McGeorge Bundy.

I do readily concede that McGeorge Bundy is a most intelligent man. Joseph Kraft, a well known American political writer, said of Mr. Bundy in 1965 in *Harper's*:

His capacity to read the riddle of multiple confusions, to consider a wide variety of possibilities, to develop lines of action, to articulate and execute public purposes, to impart quickened energies to men of the highest ability seems almost alone among contemporaries... (July 1969, p. 22).

John F. Kennedy shared this view of Bundy's intelligence for in speaking of him he said, "You just can't beat brains." McGeorge Bundy himself is not known for his modesty on the question of his intelligence. He was reported to have been "mildly miffed" when a Kennedy aide quote the President as remarking that Bundy was the smartest man he knew next to Ormsley Gore, a British diplomat.

So, then, Mr. Bundy–this man of brains–this coordinator of intelligence for President Kennedy–had reason to know that his Situation Room's announcement of Oswald as the lone assassin on the afternoon of November 22, 1963, before there was any evidence against Oswald, was premature. Make no mistake about it, Bundy, who had been in the Pentagon when the announcement of the assassination was issued, spent that fateful afternoon in the Situation Room. Jim Bishop tells how President Johnson was–while on Air Force One Flying back to Washington–"phoning McGeorge Bundy in the White House Situation Room every few minutes."

Was Bundy's Statement a Warning from the New Rulers?

I propose the thesis that McGeorge Bundy, when that announcement was issued from his Situation Room, had reason to know that the true meaning of such a message when conveyed to the presidential party on Air Force One was not the ostensible message which was being communicated. Rather, I submit that Bundy, with "his capacity to read the riddle of multiple confusions, to consider a wide varies of possibilities" was really conveying to the presidential party the thought that Oswald was being designated the lone assassin before any evidence against him was ascertainable. As a central coordinator of intelligence services, Bundy in transmitting such a message through the Situation Room was really telling the presidential party that an unholy marriage had taken place between the U.S. Governmental intelligence services and the lone-assassin doctrine. Was he not telling the presidential party peremptorily, "Now, hear this! Oswald is the assassin, the sole assassin. Evidence is not available yet. Evidence will be obtained, or in lieu thereof evidence will be created. This is a crucial matter of state that cannot await evidence. The new rulers have spoken. You, there, Mr. New President, and therefore dispatchable stuff,

and you the underlings of a deposed President, heed the message well." Was not Bundy's Situation Room serving an Orwellian double-think function?

And, so, it came to pass that Bundy's Situation Room, knew well whereof it spoke. For the federal government remained wedded to the lone-assassin myth in spite of the absence of evidence to support the proposition, and in the face of irrefutable proof which would demolish it as a rational idea.

The Presidential Party Got the Message

The presidential party, which also numbered among it men of brains, apparently got the message. None, to my knowledge, of that party has undertaken to express a single public doubt as to the veracity of the lone-assassin theory. Yet seeds of doubt have grown to mountainous dimensions among the less intimidated elements of the population who did not seek to hold or retain trappings of power. The lack of expressed skepticism among the presidential party is not to be interpreted as evidence of their stupidity. On the contrary, their silence speaks more of their strong instincts of self-preservation and their penchant for governmental careers, rather than lack of intelligence.

Some among the presidential party had no need to see the Zapruder film. They had on that fateful day witnessed first hand the bloody horror of the multi-assassin ambush. Doubts as to the veracity of the single-assassin story were more likely to give way to certainty of conspiracy in their minds. The message from Bundy's Situation Room was necessary to dispel other doubts. Perhaps some of the presidential party leaned toward misreading the situation and were laboring under the belief that some sharp-shooting nuts had gotten lucky in Dealey Plaza and that punishment was in order. Bundy's Situation Room was putting them straight. Through that announcement it became clear, to all in the presidential party who could think, that the assassins, if madmen they were, were highly placed in the pinnacle of power of the intelligence community of the United States government and that punishment of them was out of the question.

Important Foreign Policy Changes Immediately Followed the Assassination

McGeorge Bundy was quite busy on November 22, 1963. After having spent a good deal of time on the telephone with President Johnson as Johnson was flying to Washington, he managed to be at the new President's side when Air Force One landed. He was seen with Lyndon B. Johnson when the President emerged from the South Lawn of the White House. History records that Bundy remained with President Johnson to be designated by him as one of the leading hawkish advisers of the Johnson Administration.

What was the future to hold for the United States following the assassination of President Kennedy? What changed? The most important and immediate change following the assassination of President Kennedy occurred precisely in the area of foreign policy. The Cold War warriors of the Bundy brothers' stripe gained a stranglehold on the foreign policy of the nation, much in the same fashion that Allen Dulles and John Foster Dulles had in Eisenhower's administration. Yet, a careful examination of foreign policy following the killing of Kennedy is required to see whether the change might have been related to the killing of the President.

I then went on to discuss a change in policy in Vietnam, the militarization of the U.S., and how the Bundy brothers continued to Shape Hawkish Policies. Let's see what else I said about the Bundy brothers:

McGeorge Bundy and his brother, William, continued to help shape the foreign policy of the Johnson Administration. McGeorge Bundy became part of Johnson's Tuesday lunch arrangement which was in fact the National Security council, Johnson style. Bundy did most of the foreign policy coordinating for Johnnson in the early part of the administration. It was McGeorge Bundy who by happenstance was in South Vietnam when Pleiku was shelled. After an inspection of the Pleiku base, he commanded to President Johnson instant retaliation. He urged upon the President a steady program of bombing the North, which recommendation was followed with horrendous consequence to peace.

In the Gulf of Tonkin farce, Bundy was full of admiration for Johnson's decisiveness. Bundy said to friends that he had "...never seen a man who knew so clearly what he wanted to do or so exactly how to go about it."

Ultimately, the Bundy brothers gave up their titular positions in government McGeorge Bundy became President of the Ford Foundation. William Bundy joined the Center for International Studies at MIT.

So, Owen, you see that I placed McGeorge Bundy where he belonged, in the heart of the national security state and the American Establishment. Rather than exculpating from guilt these two institutions, my indictment of him perforce tends to indict the national security state and the American Establishment for the killing of Kennedy. I concede that I have not proven a case for the guilt of the American Establishment in killing Kennedy, but they certainly have cooperated in covering up the killing. That makes the Establishment an accessory after the fact to the killing and therefore criminally implicated. I firmly believe that I have proven that the national security state at its highest levels, using its agents, servants and employees on a need-to-know basis, killed Kennedy.

That, of course, does not mean that thousands of national security state operatives cooperated in the killing with prior knowledge of their criminal roles. The national security state is not structured to operate openly when it carries out an assassination. A very limited number of national security state operatives in the course of their taxpayer-financed-assigned jobs carried out their assignment to kill President Kennedy with foreknowledge of what they were doing. They were the mechanics who on a need-to-know basis were apprised of the nature of their murderous work. A very limited number of policy makers in the national security state system, and some like Allen Dulles, who were relieved with prejudice from their positions, decided upon and planned the killing operation. But that the national security state institutions were steeped in guilt in participating in the killing and covering up of the killing of Kennedy for me is not a matter for serious dispute.

That the killing was systemically the work of the national security state I accept without a reasonable doubt. That the operation was paid for from the taxpayer-provided funds of the national security state I have no question. That the national security state in terms of its mission and structure was steeped in guilt for the killing of Kennedy, I do not doubt. That the U.S. Establishment through its grip on the U.S. press cooperated in the cover-up of the killing is proven. That civilian aspects of the U.S. government, including the Chief Justice of our Supreme Court, joined together criminally to obstruct justice through the Warren Report is a matter of historical fact. That Congress, in refusing for many years to respond to the U.S. public's constantly expressed, through public opinion

polls, refusal to buy the single-assassin lie, failed in its constitutional duty is beyond dispute.

Owen, are you saying that the national security state, the Congress, the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court, the U.S. Establishment, and the U.S. press were all under the control of, or manipulated by, or completely innocent of the work of a Secret Team? Which? Are you saying that this patently Cold War assassination was not the work of the national security state which was designed to fight the Cold War?

I think that I have been fairly consistent and clear in what I have been saying from the beginning of my work. For me, you are still not clear in explaining what you feel happened and why in the Kennedy killing. Owen, I would appreciate your answering the questions put forth in the preceding paragraph.

VS (4/11/2000)

I got David T. Ratcliffe's "Understanding Special Operations–And Their Impact on The Vietnam War Era," 1989 Interview with L. Fletcher Prouty.

Jim Garrison is mentioned on pages 208-209 with respect to the newspaper parade map route alteration of the presidential motorcade. That is the total extent of Garrison and his ideas.

On page 200 of the book Prouty tells us:

And we may become mature enough in this country by 40 years after Kennedy's death to begin to lay down exactly what happened at the time he was killed: that an extremely powerful group within the United States government set up the objective of killing Kennedy in order to control the progress of the government in the direction they wanted for the next eight-ten-twelve-years. There's no question about it, looking back.

So, we learn from Prouty:

1. Nothing that has been done in terms of thinking about who killed Kennedy and why which impressed Prouty at all. 2. An extremely powerful group "within the United States government" planned and executed the killing of Kennedy. 3. The purpose was to gain control for "eight-ten-twelve-years," so the killing has no current relevance.

Next let us go to page 204, which reads:

Ratcliff: In looking back at the actual execution of the murder–the planning and execution–what role, if any, do you feel the following government agencies (or individuals within those agencies) played. I want to just put down a list here. Start with the FBI.

Prouty: I'll just say first that no agency played a role as an agency. What happens in such things as this–in fact, we had a term for it, we called it the "Gold Key Club." A certain small group coalesces and they are give an order to do something and it's not by agency. As a comparison: there was a program that had been constituted, I think in '62, called Mongoose. The objective of Mongoose was to remove Castro from office in Cuba. The people that were assigned to Mongoose (under the direction of General Lansdale), were from various agencies and various countries working together. Some others who were not from any agencies–they were hired employees from other specialties and other businesses that are competent in this business of establishing coup d'etats and things like that. So it's not correct to say that the FBI, the CIA, the Department of Defense, the State Department, had a role in this. To over-simplify, their people are bureaucrats. It could very well be (and I'm quite sure it was) that people from those agencies might have been called upon for certain special functions, but that isn't how jobs are done.

Ratcliffe: So there wouldn't be much point in looking at it by agency as far as being able to identify anyone that you felt, "Oh, yes, that person must have had this to do with it or that to do with it–"

Prouty: Not that way specifically. Those things are done. I have worked on assassinations in other countries, or the removal from office of people from other countries, and it was not done agency by agency. It was done on the basis of a very clever group arrangement which would get the job done by people who are very proficient in that type of business–and totally unknown, or "faceless."

Prouty appears to be telling me the following:

1. No agency in the U.S. government "played a role as an agency" in killing Kennedy.

2. A "Gold Key Club" assassinates heads of state, government agencies who finance the operations do not.

3. Mongoose was designed "to remove Castro from office in Cuba." Mongoose was under the direction of General Lansdale, who was CIA.

4. The people making up the Mongoose operation were "from various agencies and various countries working together."

5. But Mongoose, headed up by Lansdale of the CIA, and financed by the CIA, was not a CIA agency operation.

6. "...it's not correct to say that the FBI, the CIA, the Department of Defense, the State Department, had a role in this. To over-simplify, their people are bureaucrats. It could very well be (and I'm quite sure it was) that people from those agencies might have been called upon for certain special functions, but that isn't how these jobs are done."

No government agency was involved in the killing of Kennedy.

These agencies are peopled by bureaucrats, and bureaucrats do not kill.

Bureaucrats might "...have been called upon for certain special functions."

Apparently bureaucrats were not called upon to participate in the Kennedy assassination because "...that isn't how these jobs are done."

7. "I have worked on assassinations in other countries." I am an assassin.

8. I have worked on "the removal from office of people from other countries." I am an interloper in the affairs of other nations, and I have removed leaders of other countries in violation of their sovereignty.

9. I cannot be designated as an assassin or as a usurper because "It was done on the basis of a very clever group arrangement which would get the job done by people who are very proficient in that type of business–and totally unknown, or "faceless." The U.S. government and its agency that paid for the operations was innocent. The only guilt is on the hands of persons who are "unknown" or "faceless." The CIA which has taken credit for planning, financing and successfully assassinating and overthrowing heads of state is all wrong in claiming credit for carrying out its missions on behalf of our national security state. Only the "unknown" and "faceless" mechanics whom the Agency hired to fire the shots are responsible.

Good people, I, as usual, must be misconstruing Prouty's language. Please review Mr. Prouty's words and then instruct me as to what he was really telling us.

VS (4/14/2000)

The following is a letter to Jim DiEugenio.

Below is a verbatim copy of the letter sent to me by dear friend, Tom Katen, who was present at the luncheon in Philadelphia with Jim Garrison and me. In this letter Tom expounds on more than the nature of that luncheon meeting with Jim Garrison. What he says about matters extraneous to that luncheon conversation with Jim Garrison is, you will note, at variance with my current position on the assassination.

I feel that I have legally proven that the national security state killed JFK. That is not to say that I do not believe that the killing of JFK may not have had broader and transnational implications. But I do not feel that in a lawyer-like fashion I can prove the global theory of the killing which Tom espouses as a professor of philosophy. Therefore, I have not pursued writing about Tom's view of the assassination. Rather, I have tried to employ my skill as a lawyer to articulate and adhere to a conception of the assassination of JFK which conforms to the factual data surrounding the killing of Kennedy. Those data, I submit, prove that the national security state was institutionally involved in the killing.

I believe that Tom sees the CIA as institutionally involved in the killing, but he does not view the U.S. military as having significantly contributed to the execution of Kennedy nor to have benefited from the killing. On this matter, we now disagree. This and other areas of divergence of our thinking aside, you will note that we share a common view of what Jim Garrison was telling us at that luncheon in Philadelphia.

Tom has been of enormous help to me as a friend. He has, as you will see from the following letter, an eloquent spokesperson for a point of view on the assassination wherein he finds himself more alone than I am in espousing my conception of the assassination. Tom's letter follows:

Dear Vince:

Let me say immediately that I should never regard it as an intrusion to hear from you whom I regard as so close a friend and for whom I have the highest respect as yourself. I remember that luncheon quite clearly, and I do concur with your interpretation of the motivation for it, and also of his subsequent return to what he always understood to be the truth about the assassination.

Before saying anything else, however, let me declare there is no other person in public office in the century for whom I have higher regard than for Jim Garrison. Against an array of powerful forces no one stood more firmly nor taller than this giant of a man. He may have altered his position somewhat, not only for money but for acceptance, and because he deeply wanted to be a good novelist. As far as acceptance–I don't mean by the power structure but by a world that had come down upon him with great ridicule, and identified him as the "jolly green giant." Also subsequently in a phone conversation he remarked to me that one thing that really kept him going in dark times was the thought of finishing that novel.

Whatever that novel meant–& I do think Vince's analysis of it is correct, Jim never wavered from the fight to make a dent at some point in the power structure. Knowing him I would never make a negative judgment, but what gives credence to Vince's position is clearly at the luncheon he had made some kind of negative judgment of himself. At one point in the course of our lunch we were talking about the decline of morality in our society, and I said that it was becoming like Sodom and Gomorrah. Jim immediately said, "I wouldn't have minded being there–they had a lot of pleasure." Jim always had a great sense of humor, but his demeanor suggested that this was more than

being wry. I felt he was saying he felt he might have been somewhat immoral and could use a good contract because he did enjoy a hedonistic life style.

It is also important to realize the CIA is intelligence, and that any crude threat could not have gotten to Jim. I remember a conversation with Jacob Cohen in which he said that it was wasteful to spend energy giving talks to small groups and writing for such outlets as *Minority of One* when there could be first rate publishers and even world tours. He added "they could supply information–they wanted to get the truth also, "The CIA realized the FBI was involved." In other words, Jim would have been flattered, not threatened, into give some twist to his work.

As for his coming back home with *On the Trail of Assassins* I again agree with Vince. Jim was too honest and had too much integrity to long deviate from what he really believed. Nonetheless, I do not believe that *Trail* ever led to the source. Jim did, and he was dedicated to doing something about it, and thus I have nothing but respect for him.

All of the volumes of material flooding the market since Vince Salandria's outstanding critique of the assassination explanation by the Establishment back in 1964 are no more than footnotes to his definitive work which conclusively demonstrated "conspiracy & no lone assassin."

The next step was not to prove what had been so well set down, but to explain WHY. It is my view this has never been satisfactorily accomplished. I find the ascription of the assassination to the military industrial complex to get us into the Vietnam war superficial and untenable.

The military industrial complex fails to take us to the heights of power. And the Vietnam war was purely a political not a military action. Of course, I am here simply stating my view and not presenting my data, but I do have it. This is just not the place to go to such lengths. I will just make a couple of comments. There was no coup d'état–a change of power as a result of the assassination. The same force was in power before and after the assassination. That power had been in place throughout the whole century–and before. You know, FDR when Assistant Secretary of Navy wrote to Edward Mandel House, "The real truth of the matter is, as you and I know, that a financial element in the larger centers has owned the government since the days of Andrew Jackson..." This can be found in Arthur Schlesinger's *The Coming of the New Deal*. After JFK's assassination militarists did not come into power. Johnson inherited JFK's Establishment advisers. Virtually to a man–members of CFR. High-powered intellectuals and Eastern Establishment people–those Johnson called "The Wise Men" told him to get into the Vietnam War and to keep escalating it. It was not Johnson's war–then they suddenly took support away and told him to get out. They also ruled JFK.

I regard it as irresponsible to continue insisting JFK wouldn't have gone into war in Vietnam. That is totally a counter-factual conditional for which no evidence can be given–because all you need is an "incident" to change any plans that might have been. Besides Presidents do not make such decisions. You could have argued Wilson would never have gotten us into WWI or Roosevelt WWII, or for that matter even Bush into the Gulf War, or would Nixon have achieved détente with China? Presidents do what they are told.

Cui Bono

One thing eminently clear is that the military did not benefit from the assassination, nor the Vietnam war–and their piece of the national economic pie has

steadily decreased. Who benefited? The globalists–those moving toward one world government–new world order (Bush & Clinton), Brave New World. How do you prepare people fanatically nationalistic for a transnational world? There has to be psychological restructuring–triggered by assassination of JFK & of "his assassin"–of King & RFK–of the Vietnam War and the Counter Culture, who has the benefits? Not military but Federal Reserve, Medical Industrial Complex, Education Establishment–the foundations.

I definitely am not dead–but the world we knew is, and the assassination of society started with the bullets that felled JFK. Delgado at Yale U–paid by U.S. Dept of Naval Intelligence–said the question is no longer what is the self, but what shall we make the self to be? They didn't remake it, but are doing an excellent job of destroying it.

To sum up, I think Jim sincere and courageous, but not a threat to high level power–What is the usual threat to power? It is something to be eliminated. What happens to whistleblowers, let alone a lone individual who takes on the government? It's not to be tried and found not guilty, not get books published by mainstream publishers, not to be depicted as a hero in a major motion picture production–not to become a judge–rather to be sentenced by a judge.

You mentioned McGraw Hill–I sent them an outline of "Transparent Conspiracy," and was called in to meet with the President of the company, and he rejected the project but actually said he liked the way I wrote, and would do something in the field of philosophy. I persisted and asked what was wrong with it, and that I thought I had made a strong case. He smiled and said, "Yes, that was what was wrong with it." In a nice way he explicitly told me no one else will publish it, either.

Yes they did publish *Star Spangled Contract*–you, I am sure, are right, as you so often are in your instincts.

By the way, I am interested in why anyone should have thought I was dead. Mort Sahl said I have a passion for anonymity, and since I live quietly and simply I would have thought no one knew I was alive in the first place.

Sally and my children are fine. We home school them. Tiffany who is 9 wakes up reading and goes to bed reading. Both Tommy and Tiffany in national evaluations were in the top 99% of all tested. And Tommy while now 12 years old did a science report, and was told he should at least be in the 12th grade.

I live quietly and devote my time to my children, dogs and wife. I walk in woods about two hours each day. I, of course, do not like schools. I certainly won't call them educational institutions, but I am still teaching as I love the interaction with students. I will give them my time although I never associate with educators nor have been to any meeting in years. I am pleased that I do get enthusiastic responses from students, but each year as they come forth, they seem to know less.

I must go to walk some of my 5 dogs now, but want to emphasize it was good to hear from you, and to observe that you have made an important contribution to human understanding, not only with your ground-breaking articles, with your existential teaching–I had many of your students–and with your tireless pursuit of truth over the years.

My schedule now is rather tight with academic term winding down, and work with children, but it would be nice if at some point in the future we might find time for an in person meeting.

One last thing. A group is introducing education through resorts–in New England, New York mountains, Pocconos, and sea resorts. Someone gave my name, and I have consented to teach for a week at Ocean City Resort. I can teach what I want, but was told the customers seem to enjoy history, and so I decided to teach a course I call The Decline & Fall of the Roman and American Empires.

I think the one message most urgent is that life must become sacred for all creatures, or given our technological power there shall not be any life. I knew as our friendship bonded in our work on the assassination above all we both say underlying it all was to be humane and loving.

I feel compelled to add it seems absurd that critics are still consumed with proving what you proved about 1/2 century ago, and tilting at windmills of the military-industrial complex. State power gigantically expands while the individual is dwarfed, and personal freedom and privacy are on a path toward extinction, WTO, NAFTA, IMF, GATT rule the economic world. Media monopoly tightly controls information, and schools and colleges spread ignorance, NATO in conflict with its original purpose is being transformed into a world military force ready for military conflict as American's world police, at home no-knock break-ins are rampantly breaking down the concepts that one's home is one's castle, the state murdered at Ruby Ridge, laid siege for 53 days and slaughtered at WACO, and at Oklahoma it was deja vu with similar contradictions and lies that were parallel to Dallas, and all supposed to be the result of a fertilizer bomb incapable of causing such damage, destruction not only of innocent lives but also of guilty-incriminating evidence, and massive death brought to Iraq and Kosovo, Gulf War syndrome, and monstrous expansion of hi-tech behavior modification tactics imperil our minds and hi-tech weather modification programs imperil our earth.

I say these things not as one who is friendly to the right wing or military but only as one seeking friendship with truth and compassion.

My love to all,

Tom

VS (4/14/2000)

Here is my answer to your post, Owen, of 1:50 PM 4/11/00, and yours, John, of 11:05 AM 4/12/00.

Owen, I have read through, although not every word of, the whole book, "Understanding Special Operations". Contrary to your contention, Prouty is not saying there that "no one agency did this" (the JFK kill). Prouty said: "So it's not correct to say that the FBI, the CIA, the Department of Defense, the State Department, had a role in this." He is saying quite clearly that none of these agencies had a role in the killing of Kennedy. He was answering Ratcliffe's question regarding the killing of Kennedy. Ratcliffe asked:

In looking back at the actual execution of the murder–the planning and execution–what role, if any, do you feel the following government agencies (or individuals within those agencies) played? I want to just run down a list here. Start with the FBI.

When I said that Prouty was telling us he was an assassin, I was doing no more than quoting him. Here is what he said:

Prouty: Not that way specifically. Those things are done. I have worked on assassinations in other countries, or the removal from office of people from other countries, and it was not done agency by agency. It was done on the basis of a very clever

group arrangement which would get the job done by people who are very proficient in that type of business–and totally unknown, or "faceless."

Owen, Prouty told us "I have worked on assassinations in other countries..." Prouty is there confessing to being complicit in assassinations. He is therefore simply admitting to being an assassin.

When you quote me as saying my friends would avoid me, I was referring to a hypothetical situation if and when I accepted that the Pentagon had invented AIDS as a population control mechanism. Owen, I am proud to say that I have troops of friends who do not seek to avoid me. But, thank you for your concern.

John, my first line which to you was unintelligible was designed to state a fact, and I feel, does so plainly. I stated that Prouty acknowledged no work that came before his which was worth his consideration regarding the issues of who killed Kennedy and why.

John, I am sure happy that you have finally started your list of Special Team members by accepting McGeorge Bundy as a candidate. Pardon me if I place him in the CIA's team. He recruited for the CIA while at Harvard. His brother, Bill, was high up in the CIA. He was Kennedy's liaison with the CIA. But, draft him, if you wish, into the Secret Team. However, that is the only one you and Prouty have ever put on your list of Secret Team members. All these years and you pick one man, and he comes from a long list of people whom I named in my 1998 COPA speech as criminally involved with the national security state. I who think that agency designation is useful, and individual designations of limited or no use, seem to have been making more progress in naming names than you slowpokes.

With respect to Garrison, yes, John, I view him as solidly in my camp in terms of the institutional involvement of the warfare state in the killing of Kennedy. But I have been instructed that Garrison parted company with me and joined the ranks of those who supported Prouty's Secret Team model of explanation. I remain unconvinced of this. The fact that Garrison receives only passing mention in "Understanding Special Operations" does not lend support to the proposition that Garrison was in Prouty's Secret Team camp.

With respect to Prouty's "eight-ten-twelve-years" effort to gain control, no, I don't think that you should alter the truth because that would make the killing of no current relevance. In such a case it would still have some relevance, but not much. I reject the Secret Team model not because it is of limited relevance, but rather because it is not true. I believe that the same agencies of the national security state that had control when they killed Kennedy today maintain that same control. Yes, I agree that my model, which I think is the correct one, is today more relevant than Prouty's Secret Team "Gold-Key Club" mythology.

You next say that I misread Prouty and misrepresent what Prouty is saying. You state that he "..is contrasting Gold Key Club operations with formal agency operations. Mongoose, and other assassination projects were formal agency operations." Your language is not clear here, John, does "agency" mean various agencies or does "agency" mean "CIA?" One can't tell from the crafting of your exposition. In either event, Prouty tells us that the people who were assigned to Mongoose (under the direction of General Lansdale), were from various agencies and various countries working together. Some others were not from any agencies–they were hired employees from other specialties and other businesses that are competent in this business of establishing coup d'etats and things

like that." From that you clearly read that Prouty is telling you that Mongoose was a CIA operation? From that I can't say for certain what Prouty is saying.

You consider "...it is still obvious, God knows, that there is a universe of difference between conducting covert operations against a perceived enemy and killing your own head of state." Murder is murder. Assassination is assassination. Ends do not justify means. John, who killed MLK? Who killed JFK? A universe of difference? May I quote from your next line? "...moral concerns are given scant attention under a wartime mentality." So much for universes of difference.

You consider it unfortunate that Prouty "mistakenly interwove his explanation of how authorized assassinations were handled into an answer to a question about how the Kennedy assassination was handled." John, in wartime Prouty should be excused for unfortunately intermingling authorized and unauthorized assassinations because the "universe of difference" in the heat of war becomes rather a narrow and cramped space.

On your next point, I have already showed you where Prouty's unclear exposition makes it impossible to determine whether he was saying that the CIA was or was not institutionally involved in Mongoose. On this score and others I don't care what Prouty says. I know that the CIA was institutionally involved in Mongoose, and I don't need the quintessential insider, Prouty, to tell me.

You say that you "...think it is unnecessary and unproductive for us to continue to debate the institutional thing." I like your borrowing of the elder George Bush's "thing." It is most effective. But it is not effective enough to shut me up in imputing the blame for the killing where it belongs, in the bloody lap of our national security state agencies.

You next say that my view "does not hold significant sway except among those on the extreme left." That, John, is a clumsy job of naked red baiting. But you can't scare me with that cheap stuff. I am not a "red," whatever that is, but I would appreciate your telling me who in the "extreme left" accept my point of view on the assassination of JFK. I would not be at all reluctant to join my effort with them on this score. I would be much surprised to find them, because I have experienced from the beginning that the left was most unreceptive to my conception of the assassination.

Owen, I have read through "Understanding Special Operations," and Prouty never in this work criticizes the Defense Department for creating AIDS as a weapon. You claimed that he did criticize the Pentagon for creating that weapon? Since he did not do so in this book, where did he do so? Did he ever criticize assassination in other countries as a weapon? Where? If so, why did he do the work of an assassin?

Finally, John, I fear that you are overusing the term "rant" in describing my writing. Don't you think screed is a more sophisticated and less tired word?

MM (4/18/2000)

From a recent letter (3/13/2000) from Jim Douglass to me, which he permits me to quote:

Marty and Vince are simply not interested in assassination details. I guess they might be termed assassination metaphysicians. They think a few pertinent details are all that is necessary to unveil the entire hoax, and the military-industrial complex behind it.

In principle I agree. I agree, too, with their position that micro-analysis plays into the state propaganda that "we'll never know the truth" and should therefore analyze the crime scene and all to further death. But I also believe Marty's and Vince's bare-bones analysis of Dallas (or Memphis by analogy) doesn't fill in enough of the picture to

convince most people who are open to the truth. That's where I tend to keep investigating, interviewing, and putting more pieces together, whereas Marty and Vince say it's all obvious. The only question is our willingness to accept it. Yes to that moral and psychological truth they keep hammering home, but yes also to the need for the word to be made flesh–in perhaps deeper and wider ways than they recognize as necessary, especially through the testimony of the witnesses.

The weak point of virtually everyone who gets into these covert-action questions, beginning with me, is our radical distrust of our opponents, wherever they crop up. I doubt if in fact anyone in the correspondence group is CIA. But if they (we) all were, I hope I'd still be listening just as closely and openly to what everyone is saying. I think Gandhi was right: Everybody has a piece of the truth.

By the way, do you know that Jim spent a year and a half in jail in consequence of his non-violent acts of civil disobedience attempting to stop deployment of the Trident nuclear submarine in 1977?

Of course it was only the rogue elements of the CIA, the Secret Team, or perhaps the High Cabal itself, who were responsible for that.

MM (4/18/2000)

Conversation at the photocopy machine:

"Hi, Mike."

"Hi, Matthias."

Matthias is an ex-student, now working on his doctorate and teaching courses in American history.

"I have a teasing book for you," says Matthias. His English is near-native.

"What do you mean 'teasing,'" says I.

"I mean it will tease you."

"What's the name of it?"

"*Case Closed*."

"Oh that. He's a CIA agent, you know."

"I don't want to discuss it," says Matthias. "Like I said, it's a teasing book."

Matthias, I know from previous similar mini-conversations like this one, thinks "something is wrong," but he doesn't know what. I have told him that anybody who doesn't know what's wrong by now will never know. I don't think he takes it personally.

I'm glad he does not pursue the conversation. I wouldn't know what to say. I have the book, but haven't read it.

"It's gotten good reviews," Matthias says, leaving.

I wish I could point him to the definitive, point-by-point refutation of Agent Posner, the references that would establish the superiority of my point of view. But I cannot. Perhaps I should mention the unreadable rebuttal by Harold Weisberg, *Case Open*, who called me more filthy names in one letter than I care to recall. No. The truth is I didn't get past the first few pages of either one of these books, and have no intention of delving further into them.

Instead I contemplate my own book: *Case Dismissed*.

MM (4/18/2000)

Vince, I have friends and relatives, colleagues, and students–in fact, anybody who reads my website–who know my opinion on JFK, AIDS, and other watermelons, and they are still talking to me (if they were ever talking to me).

If they weren't, I would wonder why I was still talking to *them*.

VS (4/24/2000)

In an effort to cast light on where we are in our group discussion, I am going to in capsule fashion describe some of the dinner conversation at our home this past Saturday night. Our guests consisted among others of Federal District Court Judge, Stewart Dalzell, and his wife. John Thomas admires Stewart for his commitment to civil liberties. Two other guests was an M.D. and Ph.D., and winner of many distinguished prizes, and his wife, an oncologist. There was also an engineer graduate from Berkley and Princeton who is doing work in Russia and China.

The conversation drifted from the Elian Gonzales case, to the future of China in terms of political democracy, the heterogeneous nature of this nation's population and the benefits derived from this heterogeneity.

At a later time, the oncologist spoke of her plans to retire from oncology. The reason was that she felt that heading up a group of 120 persons, 20 of whom were doctors, helping people who had cancer was in her judgment not very meaningful when our society was causing so many people to suffer from the evils of poverty. She said that she felt that she should change her work so as to address the societal problems rather than the problems of individual patients. She spoke of how we were denying the poor decent medical help, adequate public education, housing, and physical safety. She spoke of the need to redistribute income so as to eliminate the growing disparity between the income of the CEO and the worker. She concluded by stating that she was a socialist. I quietly agreed with her conclusions about the need to redistribute income and the need to address the disadvantages of our working and non-working poor.

Stewart defended disparity of income arguing that it produced great wealth for the society, and that abundant opportunities continued to exist for upward social mobility. He spoke of his law clerk who was first in her class at the University of Pennsylvania Law School and would be starting at her next job, at a salary of $150,000.00, which exceeded his salary. My wife, Betsy, countered by stating that as an intelligent man he should not be generalizing from a particular. She pointed out that being first in her law-school class removed his clerk from the mean.

Stewart then spoke of the new billionaires who through their .com enterprises were enriching themselves and the society. I answered by stating that taxing those billionaires at a non-loop-holed 90% rate would not deter them from making contributions to our technology. Stewart conceded that this might be true, but he did not know whether a steeply graduated tax rate would not deter some of them from making further innovative contributions to the society.

At this point, Stewart shifted the conversation. He said that he was going to tell the dinner guests how he first heard the name of Vincent Salandria. He told of being a law student at the University of Pennsylvania. His professor, George Haskins, was interested in the Warren Report. He was critical of it. He wanted to arrange a debate at the law school between Vincent Salandria and Arlen Specter. Professor Haskins said that Vincent Salandria was the one who started the attack on the Warren Report, and that his work was seminal. Stewart asked Haskins who Salandria was. Haskins told him that he was a local lawyer.

I recall that I was aware of this plan, because the librarian of the law school had called me and asked for my articles attacking the Warren Commission. He told me that

Professor Haskins was preparing a debate. I wrongly had assumed that Haskins was interested in debating me.

Stewart said that the decision was made to substitute Josiah Thompson for me. Thompson debated Specter.

Some members of the dinner party expressed surprise that I was interested in the Kennedy assassination. No one followed up on that subject. The conversation shifted to other matters, and no one brought up the JFK matter again.

In 1998, when I was making my speech in Dallas, Betsy had attended a charitable event. The oncologist was also in attendance. She asked Betsy why I was not accompanying her. Betsy explained that I was making a speech in Dallas on the Kennedy assassination. The oncologist commented, "Oswald killed Kennedy alone." Betsy reported this comment to me.

I sent a copy of my speech to the oncologist's husband. I said kiddingly that I did not want to see his wife again, but that the speech was my expression of a goodbye to her. About a week later they happened upon me walking in our neighborhood. They both said that the speech convinced them that I was right. She said, "There is truth on every page." Since then we have become good friends. But we have never again discussed the assassination.

Stewart and I have lived next door to one another for over 18 years. I never mentioned the assassination to him. He never suggested until this past Saturday that he knew of my involvement in the JFK research. We have been guests in one another's homes. We have exchanged keys to one another's homes. We have conversed almost daily. He recluses himself on the ground that we are good friends from any case which comes before him in which I have any involvement.

I set forth below what all the above means to me:

* The JFK assassination is not a suitable subject for dinner conversation.

* John Thomas is correct in concluding that only those who believe that there are important systemic problems with our society will be willing to come to grips with and accept the view that I hold on the assassination.

* Apparently Arlen Specter does not share John Thomas's eagerness to debate with me. As you probably know, Specter in 1977 agreed to and then withdrew from a public debate with me after the public announcements of the debate had been circulated.

* Josiah Thompson, a present agnostic on the question of conspiracy to kill JFK, was more suitable as a debater at the University of Pennsylvania Law School on the Warren Report than I, an alumnus, who was acknowledged by Professor Haskins as "The person who started it all."

* The mass public denial of the significance of the Kennedy killing is, as Marty Schotz has so often and cogently enunciated, guarantees that this subject cannot at this time be used as a basis for people coming together politically to make us a better society.

* Even among good friends, the discussion of the Kennedy assassination at a serious level is not undertaken with ease.

* Over the years dating from 1992, we have conducted a discussion on the Kennedy assassination which until recently was most civil and even cordial and warm.

* Until I shifted my role from that of clerk to active participant, I had little or no reason to believe that we were not all in agreement on the issue of the meaning of the assassination. My views were made known to all of you through a sharing with you of

my writings, and none of you took issue with any of my expressed views until the e-mail change of my role.

* Now, are we not at the Dalzell-Salandria phase–where all of you except for John Kelin, Mike Morrissey, and Marty Schotz, and possibly Joe Stimmins–consider ourselves friends, but do not see ourselves as sharing common views on the assassination?

John, Marty, Mike and I have a couple of projects to which we will be addressing our joint attentions. We will have no need to debate what we know that we share as common views on who killed Kennedy and why.

Have I misread the present status of our exchange? Have I gotten any of your positions wrong? Is there any reason that you can offer why I should be contributing in the future to this exchange? If not, there is no need to explain. If you are of the opinion that I should continue to participate in our exchanges, I feel that there is a need for you to tell why you feel that I should, and why this should not be my goodbye to our group as it is presently constituted. In the absence of serious opposition from you, I, like my oncologist friend from her profession, hereby resign.

To the group collectively and to each of you individually I wish you well as I go on to other matters.

MM (4/28/2000)

To the Group, in Memoriam (Sept. 99-April 2000)

Some say the glass is half empty, others say half full. One marvels at the fullness of the one half, another points out the emptiness of the other half. And that it is upside down.

You are upside down, says the other.

Both you and the glass are upside down, says the other.

It has become a question of which side is up and which side is down.

There are the two sides, and here is the sideline. Why can't we see the glass, half-full and half-empty, as the same glass, even if we are upside down, respective to each other?

Prost, santé, and sláinte.